DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 316 HE 005 190

AUTHOR	Hodgkinson, Harold L.; Schenkel, Walter
TITLE	A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act: The Developing Institutions Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Jan 74
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-4927
NOTE	582p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$1.05 HC-$28.20
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Development; *Educational Finance; *Federal Aid; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; *Profile Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS	*Higher Education Act Title III

ABSTRACT

This study of Title III of the Higher Education Act develops a profile of characteristics of developing institutions, makes in-depth case studies of a selected sample of institutions that have received Title III funds, describes the impact of Title III monies on campus between 1965-66 and 1970-71, and develops indicators of institutional vitality that may be used in determining an institution's eligibility for program funding under Title III. A questionnaire was developed to examine general data about the institution and the use of Title III funds on campus. Case studies also provided information based on 2-day site visits to each institution. Results of the study are categorized into: a profile of a little-known sector of American higher education; some indicators of institutional validity; total number of grants awarded and institutional judgments of "most successful" programs; an analysis of case study data; and case studies and appendices. Case studies cover the Community Junior College of Kansas City, Kansas; Mount Saint Mary College; and Findlay College. The appendices include the questionnaire and interview agenda. (MJM)

ED 088316

HE

Final Report

OE Project Number OEC - 0 - 70 - 4927

A STUDY OF TITLE III OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT: THE DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM

Harold L. Hodgkinson

Walter Schenkel

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 005 190

-*-

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

January, 1974

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation

The research reported herein was supported by Grant No. OEC-0-70-4927 with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CONTENTS

PART I, DATA AND ANALYSIS

List of Tables v

Preface viii

Purpose of Study and Report x

The Research Design 2

  Chapter 1, The Questionnaire Survey 7

  Chapter 2, The Case Studies 18

Developing Institutions--Profile of a Little-Known Sector of American Higher Education 30

  Chapter 3, General Institutional Characteristics 34

  Chapter 4, Student Body Characteristics 39

  Chapter 5, Faculty Characteristics 54

  Chapter 6, Characteristics of Administrators 60

  Chapter 7, Characteristics of Trustees 67

  Chapter 8, Financial Data 75

  Chapter 9, Summary of Characteristics of Title III Institutions 85

Some Indicators of Institutional Vitality 89

  Chapter 10, A Theoretical Outline 93

  Chapter 11, Use and Interpretation of Questionnaire Data (IFI Items) 100

  Chapter 12, Use and Interpretation of Questionnaire Data (Longitudinal Census-Type Data) 106

  Chapter 13, Use and Interpretation of Interviewer Checklist Data 119

  Chapter 14, Indicators and Institutional Viability 122

The Institutional Consequences of Title III, 1965-66 to 1970-71 125

Total Number of Grants Awarded and Institutional Judgements of "Most Successful" Programs 128

Chapter 15, Some Basic Summary Data 138

Summary Tables for Consortia 145

Chapter 16, Use and Impact of Title III Funds on Consortia 149

Chapter 17, Consequences of Title III Funds for Participating Institutions 166

Chapter 18, Use and Impact of Title III Funds on Direct-Grant Institutions 178

Analysis of Case Study Data 188

Chapter 19, Case Study Analysis 189

Chapter 20, Consortia as Reflected in the Case Studies 222

Chapter 21, Some General Comments on the Utility and Consequences of Title III Funds for "Developing Institutions," 1965-66 and 1970-71 226

Chapter 22, General Conclusions 235

References 239

Table No.

19 ANNUAL FOUNDATION GRANTS TO DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS 77

20 OTHER PRIVATE INCOME 78

21 ENDOWMENT INCOME, 1965-1970 80

22 LIBRARY EXPENDITURES 81

23 TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS AWARDED, ALL YEARS 132

24 ALL TITLE III PROGRAMS: MONEYS AWARDED FOR 133

25 TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS--FUNDS MOST HELPFUL 134

26 MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS 135

27 MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY SPECIFIC PROGRAM 136

28 MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY SPECIFIC PROGRAM 137

29 "DID TITLE III FUNDS PROVIDE 50% OR MORE OF THE MONEY USED IN THIS PROGRAM?" 141

30 CONSORTIUM: MONEYS AWARDED FOR: 146

31 JUDGEMENT OF PROGRAM SUCCESS, COORDINATORS OF CONSORTIA 147

32 CONSORTIUM--SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS 148

33 PARTICIPATING: MONEYS AWARDED FOR: 163

34 PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS--SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION 164

35 JUDGEMENT OF PROGRAM SUCCESS, PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS 165

36 DIRECT GRANT: MONEYS AWARDED FOR: 175

37 DIRECT GRANT INSTITUTIONS--SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION 176

Table
No.

38 JUDGEMENT OF PROGRAM SUCCESS, DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS 177

39 STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT 193

40 DESCRIPTIONS OF MEASURES OF VIABILITY 196

PREFACE

So many people have been involved in the development of this study that it is difficult to know where to begin. We have received excellent cooperation from the OPBE staff and also from the staff of the Developing Institutions Office.

Our case study interviewers were extremely productive and useful. We appreciate the fact that, although they were all busy professionals in higher education, they were willing to give of their time to attend our training session, travel to the case study sites, and write up their results. A list of the interviewers for this project is enclosed.

In addition, Dr. Leland Medsker, Director of the Center for most of the period of the project, was ready to offer assistance and was very helpful on several research questions.

We would like to give particular thanks to Dr. Rodney Reed of the University of California, Berkeley, and to Dr. L. Richard Meeth of the State University of New York, Buffalo, for their wise counsel on various aspects of the project.

Preparation of the case studies was done by Stephen Brint and Beth Abiko. Mr. Brint also worked on the major draft of the case study analysis section. Data analysis of the questionnaire results was assisted by Charles Gehrke of the Center staff.

The manuscript was prepared by Morris Kleinschmidt, who was responsible for copy-editing and typing.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge our debt to these persons. Any errors should, however, be considered the responsibility of the senior author.

Harold L. Hodgkinson
Walter Schenkel

Berkeley
December 29, 1972

PURPOSE OF STUDY AND REPORT

In August, 1970, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education (CRDHE) at the University of California, Berkeley, was awarded a contract by the U.S. Office of Education for the evaluation of the impact of Title III (Aid to Developing Institutions) of the 1965 Higher Education Act. The purpose of the study was to assess the success of Title III in helping "developing" (or, more appropriately, "struggling" or "marginal") colleges to join the "mainstream of American education."*

In addition to this purpose, it was also agreed during the project that we would try, on the basis of our findings, to develop some dimensions of institutional functioning and "readiness" for the assistance of policy-makers and those who allocate money to institutions.

There were four specific tasks we were asked to perform in this study:

1. To develop a profile of characteristics of "developing institutions" as a segment of higher education in America.
2. To make in-depth case studies of a selected sample of institutions that had received Title III funds.
3. To describe the impact of Title III monies on campus between 1965-66 and 1970-71.

---

*The text of the Title III legislation can be found on pp. 31-32 of this report.

4. To develop indicators of institutional vitality that may be used in determining an institution's eligibility for program funding under Title III.

The study was quite a challenge for CRDHE, in that we had seldom conducted evaluation studies. Our knowledge of "developing institutions" in American higher education was scant; the Center's previous research by and large was focused on institutions which were quite definitely part of the "academic mainstream." Since the evaluation of educational programs was rapidly becoming a research field in its own right, we felt the time had come to apply our research strategies to the particular needs of evaluation research.

This is the second evaluation study of this particular Title of the 1965 Higher Education Act commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education. The report of the first study, conducted by Drs. James L. Miller, Jr., and Gerald Gurin, both of the University of Michigan, was submitted to the USOE in July, 1969. Since Title III had been in existence for less than three years when the data for that study were gathered, the scope of the report was necessarily limited and the findings were tentative.*

At the time we gathered data for the present study, however, Title III had been in operation for five full years, and it had become easier to interpret emerging trends.

Compared to other Titles of the 1965 Higher Education Act which had more specific and limited objectives, Title III poses particular challenges to the evaluator because of the lack of stated specific purposes. It is difficult to translate the legislation's broadly stated purpose--to help these "developing institutions" to "join the mainstream of American higher education"--into a measurable concept. We discovered very early in the study that no written administrative guidelines for defining "developing institutions" were available to us. To compound the conceptual difficulties, we had to define the term "mainstream" ourselves, since no written definitions of this concept existed either.

---

*A chart showing the major conclusions of the Miller-Gurin study appears on page xiv of this study.

The challenge of the missing parameters made the assessment of the impact of Title III an interesting undertaking. We believe that we have overcome some of the major conceptual and methodological hurdles, and we think the present study will not only shed light on the relative success of Title III but will also provide a rather detailed profile of "developing institutions" as a segment of American higher education that has, for the most part, not been too visible in the past.

For use in conjunction with some existing data bases, a questionnaire was developed and sent to the 638 institutions which have received some assistance under Title III. We also developed a series of 41 case studies of institutions that had received Title III grants, either through consortia or as direct grants, plus case studies of the USOE office that administers the Title III program, AAJC, KCRCHE, and TACTICS. Twenty-seven interviewers from outside the project were used in the case study portion of the project, plus three project staff members. Two interviewers were sent to each campus.

This report consists basically of two parts and appendices: Part I gives details about the research design, presents a broad profile of "developing institutions" as a sector of American higher education, attempts to develop indices of institutional vitality that might be used to determine a school's potential as a recipient of additional Title III funds in the future, and deals with the relative impact of Title III funds on "developing institutions." Part II presents the case studies of individual institutions with a detailed analysis, plus various appendices, including tables and research instruments. Our general conclusions are presented at the end of Part I. The reader should realize that the case studies are a vital data source in this study, and are not "tacked on." Thus the conclusions must be read as the product of all data sources used in the study.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS FROM THE MILLER-GURIN STUDY[*] OF TITLE III

Institutions with leadership, high morale and evidence of ability to change are funded by many other agencies besides Title III. (Everybody wants to support a winner.)

Great importance was attached to administrative leadership and institutional spirit or morale.

Problem: How to identify developed institutions and those too weak to use help.

Recommendations:

1. Emphasize large and medium-size grants, de-emphasize small grants.
2. Endorse cutback in NTF's.
3. Need for programs fostering administrative improvement.
4. Some consortium funding should be done through individual institutions.
5. Recommend institutional cooperation for institutions that are close to each other. Consortia can benefit from getting staff which are external to any member institutions.
6. Positive attitude toward Title III staff.
7. Need for more staff field visits; removal of travel restrictions for staff.
8. Need to develop better evaluation proposals.
9. Need to increase total appropriation for Title III.

---

[*] James Miller and Gerald Gurin, "Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected 'Developing Institutions'", USOE, Bureau of Research, July 1969.

PART I

DATA AND ANALYSIS

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation research is by its very nature policy-oriented--a funding agency sponsoring various projects is always curious as to both how and how well the funds are spent. The "how" is usually easy to assess, since most funding agencies have mechanisms (ranging from audits to reports by the grantee institution and by its own staff) which allow them to monitor projects. The question of how well monies are spent is much more difficult; it implies complex questions of judgement which a funding agency finds difficult to assess because of its subjective position as one of the partners in the donor-recipient dyad.

Evaluation studies are usually contracted out to third parties, which are expected to take a more detached and objective view than either the donor or the recipient. A proper evaluation has to fulfill at least the following two necessary conditions:

(a) The evaluation has to focus on both the donor and the recipient if it is to be complete, since the two form a closely related pair in their relationship.

(b) The specification of some of the parameters of evaluation should be left to the evaluator, since neither the funding agency nor the recipient institution--who are often in an adversary relationship--could propose parameters that might be truly acceptable by the other.

There is yet no consensus as to what the real nature of evaluation research is, but Reginald K. Carter (1971) probably comes close to stating a universally recognized negative potential of evaluation research by pointing out its inherent conservative function and its potential threat to both donor and recipient.

Our role as evaluators in this project is complicated further by other considerations. Title III is probably the single most "political" program funded under the 1965 Higher Education Act, and is the most likely to be involved in juggling non-specified value considerations, since, unlike the other titles, it affects the whole area of comprehensive institutional support. Furthermore, Title III is and has traditionally been aimed at supporting Black institutions in particular, though this has never been stated in appropriate legislation since it would probably violate the Civil Rights Act. To introduce a further complication, it is difficult to precisely interpret the legislators' guiding intent--to help marginal institutions join the "mainstream of American higher education"--since even the most knowledgeable observers of post-secondary education in this country would find it virtually impossible to determine where the "mainstream" lies.

In order to make explicit our awareness of the traditionally conservative function of evaluation research, and in recognition of the virtual impossibility of completely translating all of the possible evaluation criteria into operational concepts, we made the following decisions:

(a) Since any funding relationship involves both a donor and a recipient, success or failure of a certain funded program are at least partly the making of both partners in the dyad. We will therefore attempt to be cautious in specifically blaming or lauding programs we studied and assessed.

(b) Given the diversity of institutional forms within the Title III institutions as a group (the range of institutional forms within this group is nearly as wide as within the whole system of higher education in the U.S.), we did not attempt to define a "mainstream" and to compare Title III institutions with this imaginary concept. Our main concern has been to assess institutions agains their own past and against their individual projected futures.

The only relatively reliable form of evaluation we know of is the external financial audit, in which the auditor has the means of investigating every single financial statement submitted to him. A complete program audit attempting to approximate a financial audit in rigor would require the presence of several program evaluators for several weeks on any campus which has received Title III funds. Needless to say, we did not attempt to do this. Our evaluation has been a mixture of analyzing what is, in part, a self-evaluation instrument (the questionnaire), interpreting data from interviews conducted on a selected number of campuses, and analyzing observations and impressions of interviewers (the case studies).

The Title III program as a whole is now in a major transitional phase, and we believe that our usefulness to the persons involved in planning the new Title III program with its new emphases will be much greater if we concentrate on providing them with data on how to select candidate institutions for programs, instead of concentrating on past programs. The study has shifted toward more direct policy-oriented activities.

As it was our hope to make this report as useful as possible to policy-makers, especially to those who make the specific decisions on the use of Title III funds, we have tried to de-emphasize theoretical considerations and complex terminology. In addition, we have included a large number of the tables from the study in an appendix.

The case studies add a vivid quality to the questionnaire data that is important in the context of the entire study. They are not an "add-on," but rather an integral part of our data pool, and as many should be read as time permits.

There will clearly be more evaluation studies in the future, to help funding agencies determine future directions of their efforts based on something more than in-house information. Our hope is that such studies will be better as a consequence of our efforts in this area.

CHAPTER 1

THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

A. DEVELOPING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

At the outset of the study, we were faced with the task of collecting a wide variety of data on individual institutions as such, as well as on the characteristics of Title III programs at these schools. The data had to be longitudinal in order to yield information about the development of these institutions over time.

We had hoped to obtain institutional background information (particularly data on finance, enrollment, and faculty characteristics) from the Higher Education General Information System (HEGIS) data base, which is based on a comprehensive series of questionnaires sent out annually by the U.S. Office of Education to every post-secondary institution in the United States. Apart from the sheer quantity of data on individual colleges collected through HEGIS, the system is able to collect data from virtually every institution in the U.S., since the completion of the HEGIS questionnaire is regarded as a mandatory task by almost all institutions. Unfortunately for us, HEGIS data were not longitudinally compatible across years, as tape layouts prevented yearly comparisons. Other data sources (such as college catalogs) were only of marginal value to us.

We regretfully had to decide on a questionnaire as the major source of descriptive information on the universe of institutions receiving Title III funds, and we were faced with the problem of developing a very long and very complex instrument at a time when institutional response rates to even simple questionnaires were at a low ebb. To complicate matters further, our instrument was aimed at colleges with poor data sources and over-worked administrative staffs.

Despite these constraints, we decided to go ahead and develop a comprehensive questionnaire. Because of the diversity of the data solicited, we first thought about developing a series of short questionnaires for each institution and aiming each one at a particular respondent. We realized, however, that this plan would have been unworkable--respondents with the same function have different titles in different institutions, and the logistical problems of attempting to recover all questionnaires on any given campus would have been insurmountable. We thus saw no other way but to send each institution one large questionnaire, hoping that the college president (to whom the instrument was addressed) would route the questionnaire sequentially to all persons concerned. To get an idea of how many individuals were involved in completing the instrument, each person was asked to list his name, title, and section completed on the cover sheet. (We had no occasion to do a thorough analysis of respondents based on the cover-sheet data, but we found that, on the average, about four persons were involved in completing the instrument.)

We developed the questionnaire in two distinct parts: Part I asked for general data about the institution itself; Part II dealt exclusively with Title III and the use of these funds on campus. (A copy of the questionnaire is contained in the Appendix.) We solicited the following kinds of data:

PART I

**Attitudinal data* (president's perceptions of institutional characteristics, and of the "quality" of his school compared to others).

**Personal background data on individuals involved in making decisions about Title III programs* (president, coordinator of Title III program).

**Census-type student data.*

**Census-type faculty data.*

**Census-type data on trustees.*

**Budgetary information.*

PART II

**Attitudinal data* (Title III coordinator's views on the relative merit of various Title III programs).

**Budgetary information.*

**Narrative accounts of Title III programs and their development over time.*

We felt that the two years chosen as base years for the data solicited in Part I should coincide with the years during which Title III had been in operation nationwide so as to make it possible for us to relate general institutional data to Title III data, with enough years in between to show some patterns of change. For these reasons, we chose the years 1965/66 and 1970/71.

We used an entirely different format for Part II of the instrument. It consisted of three identical sections in different colors, each one for a different funding status--direct grant, participating institution, and consortium coordinator. A large number of colleges participate in Title III programs as both direct-grant institutions (schools submitting funding proposals directly to the USOE and receiving Title III funds directly from them) and participating institutions (schools submitting joint funding proposals with other institutions as a consortium). Some colleges also add the third funding status of consortium coordinator if they act on behalf of the consortium as a whole. We knew at the time we developed the questionnaire that schools with several funding statuses keep separate records for each funding status, and the completed questionnaires attested to the fact that the completion of more than one section posed no difficult problems for the respondent institutions.

Most of our questions in Part II of the instrument were open-ended, since we had few preconceived notions as to how institutions might use Title III funds in the broad areas of Title III programming--curriculum development, faculty development, administrative improvement, and improvement of student services.

B. QUESTIONNAIRE PILOT TEST

While we developed the questionnaire, we received many helpful suggestions from colleagues at CRDHE. By the time our final draft was approved by one of the OMB liaison persons at the USOE, we were reasonably certain that the subsequent pilot test would not require substantive changes. We submitted the final draft to a group of 12 college administrators (almost all deans and business officers) who participated in a Title III-sponsored conference; they suggested neither deletions nor additions but only a few changes in wording to eliminate some minor ambiguities. The 12 came evenly from large and small institutions. Ten were from BA-granting institutions and five were from black colleges. All of these people had had direct experience with the administration of a Title III program.

C. A SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF TITLE III INSTITUTIONS

Since Title III became operational during the latter part of fiscal year 1965-66, a total of 638 institutions have at some point received, or are presently receiving, Title III funds. We sent out questionnaires to all these institutions. Out of this universe of 638 colleges, 325 or 51% returned completed and usable instruments.* (One of the 325 described itself as "proprietary." We are convinced that this was an error on the respondent's part. The institution was kept in the data pool for analysis.) Table 1 shows how the 325 institutions compare to the universe of all colleges and universities in the United States, and to the 638 institutions that ever received funding from Title III:

---

*Follow-up procedures included a post card mailing three weeks after the first questionnaire mailing, and a letter to presidents of non-responding institutions, sent one month after the first mailing.

TABLE 1

CONTROL/AFFILIATION OF INSTITUTIONS

	Title III Institutions Having Returned Questionnaire		*All Title III Institutions Ever Funded*		*Total Institutions in United States*	
	Percentage	*N=*	*Percentage*	*N=*	*Percentage*	*N=*
Public	45%	147	45%	289	44%	1152
Private (Non-religious)	18%	57	16%	103	25%	671
Private (Religious)	37%	121	39%	246	31%	803
Total	100%	325	100%	638	100%	2626

TABLE 3

PROPORTION OF PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS

	Title III Institutions Having Returned Questionnaire		*All Title III Institutions*		*Total Institutions*	
	Percentage	*N=*	*Percentage*	*N=*	*Percentage*	*N=*
Black Institutions	15%	48	12%	79	5%	125
Other Colleges	85%	277	88%	559	95%	2501
Total	100%	325	100%	638	100%	2626

Our responding institutions are very similar to the total group of all Title III institutions.

Obviously, the 325 Title III institutions which returned completed and usable questionnaires to us are not particularly representative of American post-secondary institutions either in terms of control/affiliation, highest level of offering, or the proportion of predominantly Black colleges, nor was this to be expected. However, we did want our respondent group to be representative of Title III institutions. Private religious institutions and four-year colleges tend to be over-represented in our respondent group. Also, institutions with a predominantly Black student body constitute a three-times-larger proportion in our group than they do within the national universe of schools and colleges. If we compare the Black institutions among our questionnaire respondents to the total number of Black colleges and universities in the United States, we find that our respondent institutions include approximately 40% of all Black post-secondary schools. (See Tables 1-3.)

D. ANALYSIS PLAN

The total number of usable questionnaires returned (325 institutions) was too small to permit fruitful systematic multivariate analysis. This is especially true for Title III use data (Part II of the questionnaire), where the N's for any given variable are so small that they do not even lend themselves to simple dichotomous cross-tabulations. In the case of these Title III use data, we shall examine the percentage responses only.

The analysis of the general institutional data (Part I of the questionnaire) will consist of an analysis of cross-tabulations between two variables. The following were chosen as "independent" variables (i.e., variables which we consider in some way significant in explaining a certain phenomenon):

VARIABLE	CATEGORIES
Control or Affiliation	Public (Pub) Private, non-profit (Pr/NP) Private, church-related (Pr/R)
Highest Degree Offered	Associate (AA) Bachelor's (BA) First professional (1st Pr) Master's (MA) Other
Main Program Offered	Occupational two-year (Occ AA) Academic two-year (Acad AA) Liberal arts four-year (Lib Arts) Teaching (Teach) Professional (Prof)
Geographic Region	Southeast (SE) Plains Other
Ethnic Composition of Student Body	Black

Full-Time Enrollment, Fall 1965	0-250
	251-500
	501-750
	751-1000
	1001-2000
	2001 or more
Full-Time Enrollment, Fall 1970	0-250
	251-500
	501-750
	751-1000
	1001-2000
	2001 or more

We cross-tabulated thse independent variables with a large number of other variables chosen from among the data included in Part I of the instrument. We would have liked to explore the relationships between dependent and independent variables further by adding a third variable as a control or exploratory variable in order to state the relationship between dependent and independent variables with greater certainty. While our N's were too small to allow this, we are confident the cross-tabulations have yielded some significant and interesting findings.

CHAPTER 2

THE CASE STUDIES

A. CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Our contract with USOE called not only for an analysis of aggregate data on Title III-funded institutions as a group, but for individual case studies as well. The purpose of the latter is to provide detailed illustrations for the more abstract findings applicable to the whole universe of Title III-funded institutions.

We set ourselves the goal of collecting case study data to achieve the following objectives:

(a) To develop comprehensive institutional profiles.

(b) To describe general changes on campuses that can be traced to Title III funding.

(c) To describe in detail Title III-funded programs and to evaluate their quality and effectiveness.

To achieve these objectives, we sent teams of two interviewers each on two-day site visits to each institution. Because a large number of Black institutions were selected for case analysis, we selected 18 Black interviewers with administrative and interviewing experience. Thirty people interviewed, 27 from outside the project and 3 project staff members.

Our final list of 27 outside interviewers was developed with Dr. Rodney Reed of UC Berkeley and Dr. L. Richard Meeth, SUNY Buffalo. We relied on their experience in making the selection. All of our interviewers were familiar with Title III and with the kind of programs and institutions it represents. All persons involved in these site visits were experienced interviewers. Only one graduate student was used, the rest were teachers and administrators. We devised a training program to familiarize them with the specific requirements of our project. Early in the planning phase of the site visits we came to the conclusion that a traditional interview schedule alone would not yield enough information to achieve the three objectives mentioned above. The site visits had to yield data on the general institutional climate and on institutional vitality; we planned to make inferences about the relative success of an institution as such and the success or failure of Title III programs on campus. Because of the complexity of the data, we felt the interviewer's own appraisal of various institutional characteristics was at least as important in formulating the case studies as were the recorded interviews. We decided to supplement the traditional interview schedule with an observations checklist* for the interviewer. We also requested our interviewers to submit a summary of their major impressions of the colleges they visited These materials and auxiliary information (such as an analysis of various school publications, college catalogs, faculty handbooks, student newspapers and handbooks) served as the base for writing the case studies. Having two interviewers at each campus gave us some check on reliability of observation. In addition, we hoped that this procedure would enable us to do some comparative analysis across the case studies, and we were indeed able to do some of this. (The major problem with case study data is that cases are usually not comparable. Ours are presented in a somewhat comparable format).

---

*See Appendix, Part II, for copies of all case study materials. Also, some checklist items are contained on pp. 23-24 of this report. The training program was a one-day session held in Atlanta. The interview schedule was presented and discussed, as well as the scoring of the check list. Finally, decisions were made as to which interviewers would visit which campuses.

B. DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

As we were interested in both Title III-related information and general institutional characteristics (the latter were to provide the framework within which to evaluate the former), we planned to interview representatives of the three major groups on each campus--students, faculty, and administrators. Among the latter, we usually interviewed the college's president, the Title III coordinator, the business manager, and the director of institutional studies. We assumed--and subsequently found this to be true--that these administrators would be knowledgeable about Title III programs on campus. Our faculty interviews were conducted with both faculty who had and had not been involved in Title III; the latter interviews were scheduled to yield data on the visibility of Title III programs on campus to persons not directly involved in them. Most student interviews were conducted as panel interviews and dealt primarily with general institutional information rather than with specific

Title III-related information, as our pretest studies showed students to have little knowledge of Title III.

Because of the diversity of our respondents and institutions, we developed an interview schedule with a very flexible format. The schedule consisted of three parts:*

(a) *An interview agenda,* which was handed to the respondents before the interview and which outlined the purpose of our study and the nature of the questions to be asked.

(b) *A face sheet,* which asked for background information on the respondent. (The face sheet was disregarded in the case of panel interviews with students.)

(c) *The interview schedule proper,* which consisted of a series of open-ended questions. The included questions on the individual's personal involvement with Title III projects, his perceptions of their utility, and his general perceptions of the campus.

We had originally expected our interviews to last one hour, and we had devised only a relatively limited number of questions on both the institution as such and the Title III program. However, our pilot tests on several campuses showed that even with the limited number of questions included in the instrument's preliminary version, interviews tended to last much longer than one hour. The wealth of information received from our respondents convinced us that our instrument needed to be expanded. The pilot tests consisted of about 20 interviews conducted by project staff at four Kansas institutions.

---

* See Part II, Appendix, for copies of interview materials.

The pretest encouraged us to introduce three other changes:

(a) *Probe questions.* During the administration of the preliminary interview schedule, we found ourselves asking many unscheduled probe questions to elicit the information asked in the written questions. We later decided to include these probe questions in the instrument's final version. (See Appendix, Part II).

(b) *Sequence of questions.* We had at first assumed that the questions dealing specifically with Title III information would take most of the time; we had scheduled only a small number of questions on general institutional information and had gone on from there to spend most of our, and our respondents', time on Title III-related questions. We soon decided to change the sequence by starting out with Title III-related questions and then going on to much more detailed questions about the institution itself, which we found very useful in explaining the Title III data.

(c) *Institutional typology.* We had hoped that the Clark-Trow (intellectual-expressive-collogiate-vocational-protective) typology would be useful in encouraging respondents to decide which of the types fitted their own college best. Contrary to our expectations, most respondents refused to "type" their institution because they felt the typology to be too narrow. We therefore decided to drop the typology altogether.

The pretest convinced us that the initial substantive content of our questions yielded the kind of information in which we were interested; consequently, we neither added nor deleted questions which would have changed the content of the information solicited from our respondents.

C. DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF OBSERVATIONS CHECKLIST

Information given by a respondent to the interviewer may be very different from the reality experienced and observed by the latter. This assumption led us to develop a checklist for interviewers in which they themselves responded to our questions about general institutional characteristics. (See Appendix, Part II). We developed questions about the following broad areas of general institutional characteristics we felt to be particularly relevant to our interest in general institutional climates:

(a) *Quality of the physical campus facilities.*

(b) *Quality and commitment of faculty* (in terms of faculty morale, interest in students, concern for teaching, competence, etc.).

(c) *General characteristics of the student body* (in terms of major student activities, students' interest in their institution, etc.).

(d) *Competence and commitment of administrators* (in terms of frequency of cooperation with faculty and students, concern for innovation, etc.).

In our preliminary checklist, we asked the interviewer whether or not a certain characteristic was present on a campus, and asked them to check the applicable category in a continuum ranging from "Excellent" to "Poor". The pretest revealed that this format circumscribed the responses unduly; we therefore decided to introduce a more flexible format in which the parameters were less rigidly defined. To cite an example, our initial question about student housing was changed from

	Excellent	*Good*	*Adequate*	*Poor*
Quality of student housing	☐	☐	☐	☐

to the following:

Student housing	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Carefully planned, well suited to student needs and interests			*Dungeon-like, no concern for student interest in planning or equipping dorms*

Formulating questions in such a manner made it clearer to our interviewers what we considered to be explicit attributes of positive and negative characteristics, although this approach veered away from some notions of the Likert scale concept. (We also left space for the interviewer to add his own descriptors.) A second change introduced in the final version of our checklist was a drastic reduction of questions. We came to realize that if we treated our interviewers as questionnaire respondents who were asked to check off several dozen items along the same continuum, then the boring task of checking off the relevant categories might reduce the validity of the responses. We felt that a reduced number of items, with the parameters for each item described in detail, would yield more useful information overall.

D. THE CASE STUDY SAMPLE

After much discussion over sampling criteria, we planned to submit fifty case studies of institutions and agencies, chosen according to the following criteria:

1. Funding status (Direct grant, participating, consortium coordinator).
2. Level of funding.
3. Length and continuity of funding.
4. Geographical location.

(Due to increased travel costs, the number was later reduced to 45; 41 institutional case studies and 4 agency case studies.)

We felt that an overall evaluation of the Title III program would have been incomplete without a more detailed study of some of the major agencies through which Title III funds are channelled to individual colleges. The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE) is an example of a professionally staffed consortium in which the central administration has become a strong element in its own right. The Division of College Support within the Bureau of Higher Education at USOE is the single most crucial organization in deciding the outcome of the Title III program as a whole, since it is the "Donor"--that office which screens applications for Title III grants and administers the Title III program. The now discontinued Program With Developing Institutions of the American Association of Junior Colleges was the most important agency in channelling Title III funds to two-year colleges. TACTICS, a sort of super-consortium of Black colleges, is planning to use Title III funding to eventually provide each of its member institutions with a wide variety of special institutional and administrative support services.

With the exception of these four non-college institutions, our selection criteria for the 41 colleges in the case study sample were those which were stated on the preceding page. Drs. Meeth and Reed were used in the sampling design.

E. ANALYSIS PLAN

We have analyzed the case study institutions on two levels. First, we analyzed the data on each individual institution by using different data sources--interview protocols, observations checklists, interviewers' summary reports, and college publications. Both interview protocols and observations checklists were systematically checked and cross-tabulated. We developed some simple scales, described in Part II, that helped us in tabulating these data, and a cross-referencing system allowed us to rank each institution according to fairly complex concepts such as institutional vitality.

We have also attempted to analyze the institutions as a group. Our aim was not so much to find a common denominator (which, given the diversity of institutions, would have to be altogether too general) but rather to point out several groups of characteristics which became visible in the writing of the case studies. These post hoc typologies relate to institutional vitality and present some hypotheses on factors which affect the success, or lack thereof, of Title III programs.

TABLE 4

CASE STUDY INSTITUTIONS

1. *Direct-Grant Institutions*	*FY Funded*	*1970 Funding*
Bluefield State College, West Virginia	67 - 70	$100,500
University of Corpus Christi, Texas	68 - 70	$ 50,000
Delaware State College, Delaware	68 - 70	$ 50,000
Elizabeth City State Univ., North Carolina	66 - 70	$102,362
Lander College, South Carolina	67 - 70	$ 50,000
Lincoln University, Pennsylvania	66 - 70	$103,571
Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma	66 - 70	$ 50,000
Paine College, Georgia	66 - 70	$170,650
Talladega College, Alabama	66 - 70	$141,300
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama	66 - 70	$248,890
Wilberforce University, Ohio	66 - 70	$136,000
2. *Consortia Institutions*		
Clark College, Georgia	66 - 70	$104,000
Morehouse College, Georgia	67 - 70	
Morris Brown College, Georgia	67 - 70	
[East Mississippi Junior College, Miss.][1]	68 - 70	$319,000
Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Miss.	67 - 70	
East Central Junior College, Miss.	67 - 70	
Meridian Junior College, Miss.	68 - 70	
Findlay College, Ohio	66 - 70	$150,000
Bluffton College, Ohio	68 - 70	
Defiance College, Ohio	68 - 70	
Johnson C. Smith Univ., North Carolina	67 - 70	$ 56,800
Barber-Scotia College, North Carolina	68 - 70	
Benedict College, South Carolina	67 - 70	
Livingstone College, North Carolina	66 - 70	

---

[1] No case study was made of East Mississippi Junior College; the institution is listed here only to indicate the funding level of the consortium.

2. *Consortia Institutions (cont.)*	*FY Funded*	*1970 Funding*
Lees Junior College, Kentucky	66 - 70	$300,000
Alice Lloyd College, Kentucky	66 - 70	
Henderson Community College, Kentucky	68 - 70	
Saint Catharine College, Kentucky	68 - 70	
Muscatine Community College, Iowa	68 - 70	$156,825
Clinton Community College, Iowa	68 - 70	
[Middle Georgia College, Georgia][2]	67 - 70	$ 85,000
South Georgia College, Georgia	67 - 70	
*Rockhurst College, Missouri	67 - 70	$300,000
*Kansas City, Kan., Community Junior Coll.	68 - 70	
*Park College, Missouri	69 - 70	
St. Benedict's College, Kansas[3]	68 - 70	$100,000
Mount St. Scholastica College, Kansas[3]	67 - 70	
Saint Anselm's College, New Hampshire	67 - 70	$170,000
Mount Saint Mary College, New Hampshire	68 - 70	
New England College, New Hampshire	66 - 70	
Rivier College, New Hampshire	68 - 70	
Xavier University, Louisiana	67 - 70	$115,000
St. Mary's Dominican College, Louisiana	68 - 70	

3. *Other Institutions*

American Association of Junior Colleges

Division of College Support, USOE

*Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE)

Technical Assistance Consortium To Improve College Services (TACTICS)

---

*Pretest institutions.

[2] No case study was made of Middle Georgia College; the institution is listed here only to indicate the funding level of the consortium.

[3] St. Benedict's College and Mount St. Scholastica College merged in 1971 to form Benedictine College; the case studies of these two institutions appear under that name.

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS --
PROFILE OF A LITTLE-KNOWN SECTOR
OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The Title III/1965 HEA legislation passed by Congress included a special section defining "developing institutions":

"SEC. 302. As used in this title the term 'developing institution' means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which--

(a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;

(b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge;

(c) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

(d) has met the requirements of clauses (a) and (b) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title;

(e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;

(f) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life;

(g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and

(h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects."

(20 U.S.C. 1052) Enacted Nov. 8, 1965, P.L. 89-329, Title III, sec. 302, 79 Stat. 1229.

Since these definitions establish only the necessary, but not the sufficient, conditions for eligibility, a very large proportion of American colleges and universities could conceivably claim eligibility and submit proposals for funding under Title III. However, although no written guidelines to specify the sufficient conditions were ever developed by the Division of College Support, which administers Title III funds for USOE, the intent of the legislation seems to have been clear to institutions--only a minority of colleges and universities have been applying for Title III funds. We discussed this with USOE officials who had followed the development and final passage of this legislation and found that Title III had been intended from the beginning to provide institutional support primarily to two-year colleges, four-year colleges with predominantly black enrollments, and consortia of various types of institutions. In fact, the Division of College Support provided its consultants, who read funding proposals from hundreds of institutions, with two major criteria that had to be met by the applicants--the schools had to have a substantial proportion of students from ethnic minorities and from low-income backgrounds.

Whatever the assumptions about the nature of "developing institutions" were, very little factual knowledge about the aggregate characteristics of these schools as a segment of American higher education was available in the past. The following chapters present a profile of "developing institutions" and point out--where possible--differences and similarities between these institutions and the entire body of American colleges and universities. The data presented will deal with some general institutional characteristics as well as with the groups which compose a college and have a direct influence upon the destiny of an institution: students, faculty, administrators, and trustees. It is drawn almost entirely from the questionnaire survey.

CHAPTER 3

GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS*

A. CONTROL/AFFILIATION OF INSTITUTIONS

Of a total of 147 public institutions which returned usable questionnaires to us, over half (57%) were two-year institutions. The overwhelming majority of private non-sectarian (80%) and sectarian (78%) institutions are four-year institutions. The public institutions in our study do thus tend to be two-year colleges, while the private schools, both sectarian and non-sectarian, tend to be four-year colleges. (As we have said, we have included the one "Proprietary" institution in all analyses, even though we are sure this is a respondent error.)

TABLE 5

INSTITUTIONS RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRE BY CONTROL & HIGHEST DEGREE

	AA	*BA*	*First Prof.*	*MA*	*PHD*	
Public	84	36	2	21	4	147
Private-non-sectarian	3	45	1	7	0	56
Private-sectarian	14	94	2	10	1	121
Private-"Proprietary"	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	101	176	5	38	5	325

---

* The word "study" refers to the questionnaire respondents, unless another reference is specified.

One hundred and one, or over two-thirds (69%) of the 147 public institutions list terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level as their main focus of emphasis, while sectarian (99 of 121) as well as non-sectarian (44 of 56) private colleges tend to stress liberal arts and general programs.

A larger proportion (82 of 147) of public institutions (57%) than of non-sectarian (22 of 56, or 39%) and sectarian (51 of 121, or 43%) colleges are located in the Southeast. The sectarian institutions in our study are located in about equal proportions in the Southeast and in the Plains (43% and 46% respectively).

Of the 48 predominantly black institutions in our study, 26 (54%) are public institutions, while 14 (29%) are private sectarian schools.

B. HIGHEST DEGREE OFFERED

Eighty-eight of 101, or 87% of all two-year colleges in the study listed terminal occupational programs as their "major or main program." Among the 175 four-year colleges, a very large majority (81%) listed liberal arts and general programs as their "main program." Of the 38 colleges offering master's programs, 28, or 74% also emphasize liberal arts and general programs. A strong correlation exists among the institutions in our study between level of offering and main programs offered: two-year institutions tend to be vocationally oriented, while schools offering higher degrees tend to favor liberal arts.

TABLE 6

HIGHEST DEGREE OFFERED BY MAIN PROGRAM OFFERED--ALL
RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

	PROGRAM					
Degree	*Occupational AA*	*Academic AA*	*Liberal Arts*	*Teacher*	*Professional*	
AA	88	13	0	0	0	101
BA	25	0	142	0	9	176
First Prof.	1	0	4	0	0	5
MA	7	0	28	0	3	38
Other	0	0	5	0	0	5
Total	121	13	179	0	12	325

PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS

The black insitutions responding to our questionnaire differ sharply from the rest of our responding institutions in several ways. First, there are half as many black institutions offering the AA degree as in the rest of the respondent groups, and there are almost three times as many black institutions offering the masters degree. Their main program is in liberal arts more often than in the other institutions, and there are fewer black colleges whose main program is in occupational AA levels. Finally, our black institutions are located in the Southeast more than twice as often as the other responding institutions, with fewer black institutions in the plains area and other areas of the country:

TABLE 7

BLACK INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

	AA	*BA*	*First Prof.*	*MA*	*Other*	*Total*
Highest Degree offered	6 (12.5%)	27 (56.2%)	1 (2.1%)	13 (27.1%)	1 (2.1%)	48
All other Title III respondents	95 (34.3%)	149 (53.8%)	4 (1.4%)	25 (9.0%)	4 (1.4%)	277

	Occupational AA	*Acad. AA*	*Liberal Arts*	*Teacher*	*Professional*	*Total*
Main Program offered	12 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	35 (72.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.1%)	48
All other Title III respondents	109 (39.4%)	13 (4.7%)	144 (52.0%)	0 (0%)	11 (4.0%)	277

	Southeast	*Plains*	*Other*	*Blank*	*Total*
Region	43 (91.5%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)	1	48
All other Title III respondents	112 (41.0%)	103 (37.7%)	58 (21.2%)	4	277
				Total Respondents	325

CHAPTER 4

STUDENT BODY CHARACTERISTICS

In our attempt to collect as much information on students as possible, we used HEGIS or modified HEGIS response categories to facilitate data retrieval for our respondent institutions which did have to submit some of the same kinds of data to USOE through the very detailed series of HEGIS questionnaires. We gathered more data than we could possibly analyze within the scope of this study, but we believe a discussion of the most crucial variables in this chapter will enable the reader to gain a detailed image of the major characteristics of student bodies in "developing institutions."

A. FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT, FALL 1965 AND 1970

During the period from 1965 to 1970, responding Title III institutions jumped dramatically in size:

TABLE 8

ENROLLMENTS IN RESPONDING TITLE III INSTITUTIONS, FALL 1965 AND FALL 1970

	0-250	*251-500*	*501-750*	*751-1000*	*1001-2000*	*2001 +*
Fall '65	22 (7%)	61 (20%)	81 (27%)	47 (16%)	60 (20%)	29 (10%)
Fall '70	12 (4%)	52 (16%)	63 (20%)	55 (17%)	83 (26%)	53 (17%)

In our responding institutions in both 1965 and 1970, private sectarian institutions constituted the majority among the smaller schools with full-time student bodies up to 1,000 students. In both years, schools with full-time enrollments over 1,000 students were more likely to be public than private.

There appears to be a certain degree of positive relationship between size of full-time enrollment and highest degree offered, a relationship that can be observed for both years. There also appears to be a positive relationship between size of full-time enrollment and major emphasis of program offered. Both during fall, 1965, and fall, 1970, schools with full-time enrollments of 250 or fewer students emphasize terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level, while schools with enrollments over 250 students are more likely to stress liberal arts and general programs.

During the 1965-1970 period, enrollments at Title III institutions moved toward the larger categories, although in 1970, 63 were still in the less than 500 student category. The number in the over 2,000 student area had almost doubled. Black colleges more than matched the trend, although they had fewer institutions proportionately in the under 500 area. (This, of course, was a time of growth throughout higher education.)

TABLE 9

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS IN TITLE III COLLEGES

	0-250	250-500	500-750	750-1000	1000-2000	2000 +
1965	21	61	80	46	60	29
1970	12	51	61	55	83	53

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS IN BLACK COLLEGES IN TITLE III

1965	1	5	11	5	14	8
1970	1	3	7	6	16	4

B. COMPOSITION OF STUDENT BODY BY PARENTAL INCOME

We have been primarily interested in locating those institutions in which students from lowest-income families (annual parental income under $3,000) and low-income families (annual parental income between $3,000 and $5,999) form a significant number, in that this is one of the Title III program selection criteria.

One hundred and seventy-three of our 325 responding institutions did not provide us with data on the composition of student body by parental income for the year 1965, and about a third of our respondents failed to provide us with these data for 1970.

TABLE 10

PARENTAL INCOME LESS THAN $3000 (LOWEST-INCOME) BY YEAR

Percent of students	*0-5%*	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*	*Total institutions*
Fall '65	93	16	22	11	7	3	152
Fall '70	100	49	39	22	8	1	219

Based on the previous table, however, it would seem that the number of schools with between 6% and 50% of lowest-income students has increased considerably between 1965 (49 institutions) and 1970 (110 institutions). This suggests either that a number of Title III institutions have increased their enrollment of lowest-income students, or that Title III funding has shifted to schools which are more accessible to these students. In that most Title III institutions receive relatively continuous funding, it suggests that the first of these two hypotheses is most likely correct.

All 9 schools in which students from lowest-income backgrounds actually form a majority of the student body in 1970 are colleges that have a predominantly black enrollment. Given the relatively large size of black institutions, this is an interesting finding.

Colleges with 6% to 50% minorities of students from lowest-income backgrounds. In 1965, the majority of schools with 6% to 50% of lowest-income students were found among public institutions. In 1970, this was still true of institutions with lowest-income enrollments of 6% to 25%; however, the majority of schools with lowest-income enrollments of 26% to 50% were now private sectarian colleges.

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF PARENTAL INCOME BELOW $3000 A YEAR (LOWEST-INCOME) BY CONTROL

1965

	0-5%	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*
Public	41	12	14	6	3	1
Private non-sectarian	18	1	3	3	0	0
Private sectarian	34	3	5	2	4	2

1970

	0-5%	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*
Public	46	24	29	5	6	0
Private non-sectarian	20	7	3	5	0	0
Private sectarian	33	17	7	12	2	1

While the schools with over 5% lowest-income enrollments were about evenly distributed among two-year and four-year liberal arts colleges in 1965, the situation had changed in 1970; the majority of institutions with over 5% lowest-income students were now found among four-year liberal arts colleges.

In terms of main programs offered, the distribution of lowest-income students did not change between 1965 and 1970; in both cases, institutions with over 5% of lowest-income students were about evenly distributed among those colleges stressing primarily terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level and colleges stressing liberal arts and general curricula.

The geographic distribution of institutions enrolling over 5% of lowest-income students shows that in 1965 41 were located in the Southeast and 11 in the Plains, while in 1970 36 were located in the Plains, 49 in the Southeast.

In 1965, colleges enrolling more than 5% of lowest-income students tended to have total enrollments of 750 or fewer students; in 1970, institutions with more than 5% lowest-income students were as likely to be found among colleges with enrollments of more than 1,000 students.

Colleges with 6% to 50% minorities of students from low-income backgrounds. There are more institutions with 6-10% enrollments of low-income (between $3,000 and $5,999), students than there are of lowest-income, students (0-$3,000). In both 1965 and 1970, schools with a 6% to 10% enrollment of low-income students were about equally divided between public and sectarian colleges. In both 1965 and 1970, schools with larger low-income enrollments (11% to 50%) were primarily to be found among public institutions.

In both 1965 and 1970, schools with 6% to 50% minorities of low-income students were found primarily among four-year liberal arts colleges. It thus comes as no surprise that in both years schools with 6% to 50% minorities of low-income students were found primarily among institutions offering liberal arts and general curricula.

In both 1965 and 1970, schools with large minorities (between 11% and 50%) of low-income students were located predominantly in the Southeast.

Low- and lowest-income enrollments in predominantly black colleges. Of the 48 predominantly black institutions which returned usable questionnaires, 8 did not provide us with any data on students' parental incomes and 10 others gave us no 1965 data. Nevertheless, the data seem to indicate that, while in 1965 the number of black institutions with different rates of lowest-income minorities was about equal, the distribution shifted in 1970 to a majority of black institutions with lowest-income enrollments between 11% and 50%:

TABLE 12

PARENTAL INCOME BELOW $3000/YEAR (LOWEST-INCOME)--BLACK COLLEGES

	0-5%	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*
1965	7	3	4	7	6	3
1970	4	2	12	13	8	1

In 1965, there were 11 black institutions out of 30 reporting that they had between 11% and 50% of their students from families with parental income between $3,000 and $5,999 per year (low-income). In 1970, 25 out of 40 reported 11% to 50% of their students were from this low-income category.

TABLE 13

BLACK COLLEGES, PERCENT OF PARENTAL INCOMES $3,000 - $5,999

	0-5%	6-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
1965	6	2	9	12	0	0
1970	1	1	12	23	2	1

While the distribution of low-income students for our study as a whole has remained quite static between 1965 and 1970, the distribution of lowest-income students seems to have shifted somewhat away from public two-year colleges to four-year sectarian liberal arts colleges. The Southeast still remains the area in which those institutions with the highest proportions of low- and lowest-income students are located.

Black institutions as a group have always enrolled large numbers of students from low- and lowest-income groups. Between 1965 and 1970, the number of black institutions with sizeable minorities of low- and lowest-income students has increased significantly, possibly due to considerable increases in federal student financial aid funds which became available to these colleges during the second half of the 60's.

C. COMPOSITION OF STUDENT BODY BY ETHNIC GROUP (BLACK STUDENTS)

Our prime interest has been in following enrollment trends for black students within "developing institutions" as a group between 1965 and 1970. While we recognize the importance of studying enrollment trends for other ethnic minorities as well, we realized from the beginning that the disproportionately large number of responding institutions would be located in the Southeast, where ethnic minorities other than blacks are small. Our response categories for the question on ethnic distribution were "Black," "Caucasian," and "Other." Even though "Other" represents an aggregate of all non-black ethnic minorities, our return rates indicated that non-black ethnic minority enrollments in our responding institutions were almost without exception proportionately small in 1965 and remained that way in 1970. Only two institutions had more than 5% non-black ethnic minority enrollments in 1965 and 1970, and represent such a small number as to be insignificant for the purpose of this study. Hence, this section will deal with black enrollment rates only.

The majority of colleges with both the lowest (0% to 5%) and the highest (76% to 100%) black enrollment rates were four-year institutions in both 1965 and 1970. One hundred and seventy-two colleges had 0%-5% black students in 1965 and 184 did in 1970. There were very few institutions (16) with black enrollments between 6% and 50% in 1965; in 1970 the number had increased to 72.

In terms of control or affiliation, the majority of institutions with black enrollment rates between 6% and 50% were public institutions in both 1965 and 1970; the largest group of colleges with very low black enrollment rates (5% or less) were sectarian institutions in both 1965 and 1970.

Concurrently, the schools with both the lowest (5% or less) and the highest (76% to 100%) enrollment of black students were institutions

TABLE 14

PERCENT OF BLACK STUDENTS BY MAIN PROGRAM OFFERED

1965

	Occupational AA	*Academic AA*	*Liberal Arts*	*Teaching*	*Professional*
0-5%	58	10	95	0	8
5-10%	9	0	2	0	0
11-25%	3	1	0	0	0
26-50%	0	0	0	0	0
51-75%	1	0	0	0	0
76-100%	8	0	32	0	1

1970

	Occupational AA	*Academic AA*	*Liberal Arts*	*Teaching*	*Professional*
0-5%	61	9	102	0	11
6-10%	23	2	17	0	0
11-25%	16	1	6	0	0
26-50%	3	0	0	0	0
51-75%	1	0	2	0	0
76-100%	8	0	31	0	1

emphasizing liberal arts and general programs, while the schools with black enrollment rates between 6% and 50% were colleges offering terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level in both 1965 and 1970.

D. PROPORTION OF OUT-OF-STATE STUDENTS

No change of pattern emerged between 1965 and 1970 in the distribution of out-of-state students (only full-time students were considered). In terms of control or affiliation, the majority of colleges with out-of-state enrollments of 10% or less were public institutions, while most schools with out-of-state enrollments between 10% and 50% tended to be sectarian colleges. Eleven of the 12 schools in which out-of-state students actually constituted a clear majority (between 76% and 100%) of the student body were private schools.

The above distribution is corroborated by the distribution of out-of-state students in terms of highest degree offered by a school. In 1970, 73 of the 116 colleges with out-of-state enrollments of 10% or less were found among two-year colleges; 144 of the 188 schools enrolling over 10% out-of-state students were four-year colleges.

A second corroboration of the distribution of out-of-state students in terms of institutional characteristics is evident when the distribution is examined according to the main programs offered by the colleges in our study. As one would suspect, 78 of the 117 schools with low (10% or less) out-of-state enrollments were colleges offering terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level as their main program; 144 of the 193 schools having out-of-state enrollments over 10% were institutions stressing primarily liberal arts and general programs.

In both 1965 and 1970, colleges with predominantly black student bodies had relatively high out-of-state enrollments. About half of the 48 black institutions which returned questionnaires to us reported out-of-state enrollment rates ranging from 11% to 50% of the total student body while only 1/3 of our total responding institutions did.

For the respondent institutions as a group, out-of-state enrollment patterns have not changed between 1965 and 1970; in both cases, schools with the lowest out-of-state enrollment rates were public two-year colleges. Schools with larger out-of-state enrollments were four-year sectarian liberal arts colleges, and schools with the highest rates (between 76% and 100%) were non-sectarian private liberal arts institutions.

E. PROPORTION OF STUDENTS LIVING ON CAMPUS

Are "developing institutions" primarily residential, or are they street-car colleges? As in the case of out-of-state enrollments, the general situation remained virtually the same in 1970 as in 1965. In 1970, 144 institutions reported less than 50% of their students were living on campus, while 146 reported more than 50% residential students. The majority of institutions with 50% or fewer of students living on campus were public colleges, while the majority of institutions with 51% or more of the students living on campus were sectarian colleges.

The majority of schools with very low proportions of students living on campus (5% or fewer) were two-year colleges, while the majority of colleges with larger proportions of on-campus students were four-year colleges.

Most institutions with relatively low proportions of students living on-campus were schools offering primarily terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level, while most schools with relatively high proportions (25% to 100%) were colleges stressing primarily liberal arts and general programs.

Black institutions (almost all of which, among the 48 respondent institutions, are four-year colleges) were heavily residential in both 1965 and 1970. Eighty-three percent of these schools had resident student populations constituting between 26% and 100% of the total student body, and over half had resident student populations constituting over 50% of the total student body.

In terms of percentages of students living on campus, "developing institutions" are fairly similar to colleges which do not receive Title III Funds. Public two-year institutions tend to be non-residential, while private four-year liberal arts colleges tend to have at least a sizeable proportion of the student body living on campus.

F. NUMBER OF STUDENTS GRADUATED, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

The sharp increase in the number of college graduates between 1965/66 and 1970/71 provides the best evidence of the growth of higher education during that period in the United States.* This trend has also very much affected "developing institutions."

In 1965, 231 of our respondent institutions graduated 200 or fewer students, 95 were public, 101 were sectarian institutions. Fifty-eight institutions (of which 36 were public institutions) graduated over 200 students. Five years later, the number of schools graduating over 200 students had grown to 144; the majority (85) of colleges with 200 or fewer graduates were sectarian colleges, while the majority (101) of schools with over 200 graduates were public institutions. This growth in numbers of graduates was impressive.

---

* H. Hodgkinson, *Institutions in Transition* (Carnegie Commission, 1970).

In 1965, 234 of our respondent institutions reported 200 or fewer graduates. Among the 58 institutions reporting over 200 graduates, the largest groups (26) were colleges offering programs up to the master's level. Five years later, when the number of schools producing 200 or fewer graduates had shrunk to 164; 102 of those schools were colleges offering four-year programs. Sixty-two institutions graduating from 201 to 500 students were among the four-year institutions; however, schools offering programs up to master's level still constituted 15 of the 32 colleges graduating over 500 students.

Little change occurred between 1965 and 1970 in the distribution of schools in terms of number of students graduated and major programs offered by those schools. In both years, the two largest groups of institutions graduating 100 or fewer students were colleges that either stressed two-year terminal occupational programs or liberal arts programs. In both 1965 and 1970, the majority of institutions graduating over 100 students were colleges focusing on liberal arts programs.

In 1965, 22 of the 48 predominantly black institutions reported graduating between 101 and 200 students. Five years later, 41 of these 48 institutions reported graduating between 101 and 500 students, while 27 were graduating 200 to 500 students.

Finally, the relation between number of students graduated and total full-time enrollment was strongly positive in both 1965 and 1970. In both cases it was clear that the larger the total enrollment, the larger the number of students graduated.

A composite assessment of increases in graduation rates among "developing institutions" shows that (a) the number of schools graduating over 200 students a year rose considerably within five years, and (b) that the growth was particularly marked in public liberal arts institutions offering programs up to the master's level (such as state colleges and universities). This is both an indicator of larger entering classes and/or greater holding power. The trend toward increased graduating classes was strong in black colleges.

CHAPTER 5

FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

Much has been written on how slow faculty have been to adapt to change, and on how little faculty characteristics have changed over time. This chapter will examine whether "developing institutions" as a group did show any significant changes in faculty characteristics between 1965 and 1970. While this five-year period may have been too short to allow any major changes to occur, this was nevertheless an era of far-reaching changes in American higher education.

Faculty characteristics and their changes will be examined in terms of four major variables: proportion of black faculty, proportion of faculty holding earned doctorates, proportion of junior faculty (assistant professors), and proportion of faculty in the humanities and natural science fields.

A. PROPORTION OF BLACK FACULTY, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

Within the last few years (especially since the late 60's), many colleges and universities have actively tried to recruit black faculty members; this has happened at a time when the number of qualified black candidates for teaching positions has been increasing.

While the number of "developing institutions" with very low proportions of black faculty (5% or less) has remained approximately the same between 1965 (247 institutions) and 1970 (256 institutions) there has been a very slight increase in the number of colleges with a proportion of black faculty ranging from 11% to 50%. Within institutions whose faculties are predominantly black, the emphasis has shifted somewhat away from nearly all-black faculties to faculties in which blacks represent between 51% and 75% of the teachers. This change seems to have occurred primarily in black public institutions.

In terms of highest degree offered by an institution, the distribution of blacks on faculties has remained approximately the same in schools where blacks constitute the majority of the faculty. As expected, colleges in which blacks are a majority on faculties tended to be liberal arts colleges and in the Southeast in both years.

The proportion of white faculty in colleges with predominantly black enrollments has increased somewhat between 1965 and 1970. While colleges with nearly all-black faculties constituted the single largest group in 1965 (20 of 48 institutions) colleges with faculties on which blacks constitute between 51% and 75% had become the largest group by 1970 (27 of 48).

The data show conclusively that, with the exception of colleges with predominantly black student bodies, blacks constituted, at best, minuscule proportions on faculties of "developing institutions" in

1965 and continued to do so in 1970. In state colleges with predominantly black enrollments, the proportion of white faculty seems to have increased somewhat. Increasing the proportion of minority faculty has not been a major objective of the Title III program.

B. PROPORTION OF EARNED DOCTORATES OF FACULTIES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

The proportion of earned doctorates in a faculty is a traditional measure of faculty quality. While the validity of this measure has been challenged recently (and we agree that it would be an untested measure of faculty quality if "quality" was interpreted as "quality of teaching"), it is nevertheless so widely used that we feel the need to explore it.

Although national data is not very good, one could expect developing institutions to have proportions of earned doctorates on their faculties which range from about 26% to 50%. If we accept this as a satisfactory proportion, we can see that our respondent institutions as a group did considerably better in 1970 than in 1965. While there were only 92 among our 325 respondent institutions which reported a proportion of 26% or better of earned doctorates on their faculties in 1965/66, the number rose to 152 in 1970/71. On the other hand, the number of institutions with proportions of earned doctorates on their faculties ranging from 11% to 25% decreased from 104 to 67 within the same period.

In both 1965 and 1970, the majority of institutions with proportions of earned doctorates constituting 26% or more of their faculties were to be found among sectarian colleges. Not surprisingly, these institutions were four-year institutions offering primarily liberal arts and general programs in both 1965 and 1970. These institutions tended to be located primarily in the Southeast.

Among our respondent institutions as a group, the proportion of colleges with 26% or more earned doctorates on their faculties increased from about 35% to about 46%. In the case of predominantly black institutions, the proportion rose from 37% to just about 69% within the same time span; progress in upgrading the quality of their faculties has thus been much more pronounced among black "developing institutions" than among the group of respondents as a whole.

In terms of institutional size, the majority of colleges with 26% or more of their teachers holding earned doctorates were relatively small institutions in 1965 with full-time enrollments between 501 and 750 students. Five years later, the majority of colleges with the same faculty characteristics were schools with enrollments between 1,001 and 2,000 students.

C. RANK DISTRIBUTIONS OF FULL-TIME FACULTIES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

We have been particularly interested in trends affecting junior faculty. The distribution of faculty according to rank presents a zero-sum situation in which an increase in one category is at the cost of a simultaneous and equivalent decrease in another category.

We have found that most developing institutions do not have "instructor" as a full-time career rank; the "assistant professor" rank is now the rank most commonly assigned to beginning teachers. This is the reason we have chosen "assistant professor" as the one rank upon which we shall focus. The data is based primarily on four-year colleges since most two-year colleges do not have a rank system.

There has been a rather important shift in the proportion of assistant professors on faculties between 1965 and 1970. In 1965, about 46% of our respondent institutions had between 26% and 50% assistant professors on their faculties; five years later, the proportion of such institutions had risen to 57%. As a group, "developing institutions" seem to have become more open to younger faculty. One hypothesis is that these few faculty may be more likely to introduce new ideas than their older peers.

Among institutions with between 26% and 50% assistant professors on their faculties, sectarian colleges represent the single largest group. These colleges also tend to be four-year institutions offering primarily liberal arts and general curricula. The largest group of those colleges was located in the Southeast.

Among predominantly black "developing" institutions, the proportion of schools with between 26% and 50% assistant professors on their faculties rose even more than for the "developing institutions" group as a whole, namely from 52% to 68%.

In terms of enrollments, institutions with 26% to 50% of assistant professors on their faculties were found primarily among rather small (501 to 750 students) schools. Five years later, schools with this faculty characteristic tended to be schools with enrollments between 1,001 and 2,000 students.

D. AGE DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

To see whether the trend toward opening up teaching positions for junior faculty members holds for two-year colleges as well, we shall examine the proportion of faculty members within the age group of 20-35 years, approximately the age group from which assistant professors are hired.

In 1965, about 48% of all respondent institutions had between 26% and 50% of faculty within the age group 20-35. Five years later, the proportion had risen to 63%. This finding provides further evidence that as a group, "developing institutions" have become somewhat more open to younger faculty.

Major Subjects Taught

For most developing institutions, humanities constitute the numerically most important field. Fifty-three percent of all respondent institutions report that in 1965 between 26% and 50% of the faculty taught humanities; the rate went up ten percentage points to 63% in 1970.

In both 1965 and 1970, the largest group of schools with large proportions (between 26% and 50%) of humanities teachers was to be found among sectarian colleges, four-year institutions, and institutions offering primarily liberal arts and general programs.

CHAPTER 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADMINISTRATORS

In our instructions to respondents completing the questionnaire, we defined "administrators" as "college employees in supervisory positions who are not simultaneously members of the faculty [nor] . . . department and/or division chairmen." Our intention was to have the respondents include all administrative personnel with decision-making prerogatives who were not primarily faculty members.

A. NUMBER OF FULL-TIME ADMINISTRATORS, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

The number of full-time administrators as defined above has grown between 1965 and 1970. In 1965, 54% of all institutions in our study had nine or fewer administrators; five years later, 55% had ten or more administrators. The majority of schools with four or fewer administrators during both years were public institutions.

In terms of highest degree offered, institutions reporting four or fewer administrators tended to be two-year colleges in both 1965 and 1970, while institutions reporting larger numbers of administrators were more likely to be four-year colleges.

Most institutions reporting very small numbers of administrators were schools offering primarily terminal occupational curricula below the bachelor's level in both 1965 and 1970. Schools with large numbers of administrators (10 or more) tended to be colleges focusing on liberal arts and general programs.

The growth of administrative staffs has been particularly marked among black colleges. In 1965, only 45% of these schools had administrative staffs of ten or more persons; five years later, 73% of all black institutions in our responding institutions had administrative staffs of that size. Thus, the growth of college administrations between 1965 and 1970 has been considerably more marked in black institutions than in our responding institutions as a whole.

Parkinson's Law notwithstanding, there is a positive correlation between the size of a college and the number of its full-time administrators. In both 1965 and 1970, the largest group of schools with four or fewer administrators were colleges with enrollments between 251 and 500 students; during both years, the schools with the largest number of administrators (15 or more) were colleges with enrollments of more than 1,000 students. We can infer that the growth in size of administrative staffs has been accompanied by an increasing degree of administrative specialization.

B. PROPORTION OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

Between 1965 and 1970, the proportion of schools employing sizeable proportions of women (between 11% and 50%) in supervisory and managerial administrative positions has grown from 145 to 167, or 43% to 50%.

TABLE 15

PROPORTION OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS, 1965 - 1970

	0-5%	6-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
1965/66	83	27	80	65	12	28
1970/71	71	36	111	56	21	13

During both years, almost all of the schools employing a majority (over 50%) of female administrators were found to be sectarian institutions.

The colleges with the lowest proportion of female administrators (5% or fewer) were generally two-year institutions and colleges focusing on terminal occupational curricula below the bachelor's level.

The proportion of female administrators in black colleges increased somewhat more strongly (from 50% to 62%) than in all "developing institutions" as a group.

In terms of enrollments, the largest group of colleges with a predominantly female administrative staff tended to be relatively small institutions with 750 or fewer students. In both 1965 and 1970, institutions with relatively important proportions of female administrators (between 6% and 25%) tended to be schools with more than 1,000 students. It would thus appear that an increased functional specialization among administrative staffs increases the need for women administrators in particular areas (e.g., dean of women, director of physical education programs for women). However, unless we disregard the case of Catholic colleges for women, it would seem that the position of women in administration at our reporting institutions is still relatively marginal.

C. PROPORTION OF ADMINISTRATORS WITH MASTER'S DEGREES

In an era of increasing functional specialization of administrative tasks in colleges and universities, many institutions of higher education (and particularly the schools of education of large universities) have established systematic training programs for college administrators in different functional areas. These programs are usually offered on the graduate level and lead to master's and doctoral degrees. We became interested in finding out whether administrators on the campuses of our respondent institutions did employ persons with master's degrees and to what extent. We realize, of course, that there may be quite a few college administrators with master's degrees in academic fields, and our data do not differentiate between the two types of master's degrees. We do believe, however, that a master's degree from either type represents an academic (or intellectual) level of achievement which entitles its holder to the label of "professional" administrator.

We emphasize that the data discussed below do not include persons who are likely to hold a higher degree than the master's (such as a doctorate), although many of our respondents may have administrative staff members who possess the doctorate as well. We asked respondents to eliminate presidents on this question, as we are interested in those persons for whom a doctorate is not a prerequisite for obtaining a supervisory or managerial administrative position.

In both 1965 and 1970, approximately 38% of all schools in our study employed between 26% and 50% administrators holding master's degrees. During both years, the largest group of these schools were sectarian colleges. Among the smaller number of schools who employed over 50% of administrators holding a master's degree, most institutions were public schools in both 1965 and 1970. During both years, the majority of institutions having between 26% and 50% administrators holding master's degrees in their employ were four-year colleges, while those institutions with a majority of master's degree holders on their administrative staffs were two-year colleges.

It comes, therefore, as no surprise to find that the majority of institutions having between 26% and 50% master's degree holders on their administrative staffs are those stressing liberal arts and general curricula, while those in which most administrators hold master's degrees are colleges specializing in terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level. In short, public two-year institutions in our study were more likely to employ administrators with master's degrees than sectarian four-year institutions in both 1965 and 1970.

If we regard an increase in the proportion of master's degree holders on the administrative staffs of black colleges as indicative of an increase in administrative sophistication, we find there has been a significant improvement between 1965 and 1970. During the former year, 66% of the black institutions in our study had over 25% master's degree holders on their administrative staffs; five years later, the proportion had risen to 83%.

D. NUMBER OF FACULTY HOLDING PART-TIME ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

We were interested in finding out how many faculty members held "bona fide" part-time administrative positions, i.e., how many faculty held positions budgeted to both administrative and faculty salaries. While some faculty members (such as department and/or division chairmen) have administrative duties and are often compensated for their administrative duties with reduced teaching loads, these faculty are usually regarded (and most often regard themselves) as faculty rather than administrators. Bona fide faculty members with part-time administrative positions may share a part-time teaching appointment with a part-time deanship or a part-time directorship. Institutions with a number of such split appointments have small and undifferentiated administrative staffs, are relatively small themselves, and are less "complex" than the larger institutions.

Over one-third of all reporting institutions reported they had no part-time administrators who simultaneously held a part-time faculty position as well in both 1965 and 1970. Another one-third reported they employed four or fewer persons with split administrative/faculty appointments during both years. Only a very small minority of schools reported employing five or more such persons in 1965 and 1970. For "developing institutions" as a group, the part-time administrator is thus a rather marginal figure.

Among schools with between one and six part-time administrators, the largest groups tended to be sectarian institutions in both 1965 and 1970. Schools with seven or more such part-time administrators tended to be public institutions during both time periods. In terms of highest degree offered, schools employing part-time administrators during both years tended to be four-year institutions offering primarily liberal arts and general curricula.

In schools with predominantly black enrollments, there seems to have been a slight decline in the number of part-time administrators. In 1965, 37% of the 48 institutions in our study reportedly employed two or fewer part-time administrators, while the proportion of these institutions employing two or fewer part-time administrators rose to 51% in 1970. It would seem, however, that despite their lessened reliance on such administrators, the black institutions in our study are still somewhat more reliant on faculty/administrators than are "developing institutions" as a whole.

CHAPTER 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUSTEES

In most institutions of higher education, trustees as a group are virtually invisible to the larger campus community; and yet, despite their lack of visibility and their very small size compared to students and faculty, they often have more power than any of the other groups in influencing decisions affecting an institution. Studies of trustee backgrounds have been relatively rare, compared to the number of studies focusing on students, faculty, and administrators. We wanted to know the extent to which these governing boards actually exercise their authority. Also, trustee background data, we thought, might help explain the character of an institution.

More particularly, we wanted to know whether the proportion of various groups (blacks and women) on governing boards had increased in "developing institutions," and whether their trustees were in fact active in college governance. (We did not have the time or the opportunity to observe the workings of governing boards in our case studies; however, we decided to use proxy measures that can at least yield information on whether or not trustees are _potentially_ able to be active in governing their institution.

We felt that time and distance might be two variables that would provide some indication of potential activity, although they are not direct measures. The proxy measures we used were annual number of board meetings and the proportion of trustees living within 100 miles of the institution.) We will use these proxy measures with caution.

A. PROPORTION OF BLACK TRUSTEES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

There are certain types of governing boards on which black trustees are still not common, such as the boards of various types of sectarian colleges. On the other hand, the more "open" types of institutions (such as non-sectarian private colleges and public colleges) with previously all-white governing boards are now more likely to have at least some black members.

In both 1965 and 1970, the vast majority of "developing institutions" had no blacks, or virtually none, on their governing boards. However, while the number of institutions reporting between 11% and 50% amounted to only 7% of the 1965 total, their number rose from 20 to 34 within five years:

TABLE 16

PERCENT OF BLACK TRUSTEES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

	0-5%	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*
1965/66	247	4	5	15	5	6
1970/71	233	12	16	18	8	4

TABLE 16 (continued)

PERCENT OF BLACK TRUSTEES, BLACK COLLEGES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

	0-5%	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*
1965/66	7	1	2	14	5	6
1970/71	7	1	1	17	8	3

During both years, the largest proportion of institutions with sizeable minorities of blacks on their boards were public colleges and institutions offering two- and four-year curricula. In both years, the largest proportions of boards with between 6% and 25% black members were found among schools offering primarily terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level, while the largest proportion of boards with between 26% and 50% of black board members was found among colleges stressing liberal arts and general curricula.

While the old "missionary" colleges for blacks started by white religious denominations were originally governed by white boards,* the proportion of blacks on the boards of these institutions has increased dramatically within the last decade. The case of the predominantly black state colleges has been different, but changes have also taken place in the composition of their governing boards.

The case of the black "developing institutions" does not reflect the trend toward a greater liberalization, i.e., toward greater black participation in the governance of predominantly black institutions. Out of our group of 48 black "developing institutions," 17% had a proportion of 10% or fewer blacks on their boards in both 1965 and 1970.

Within that five-year period, the number of black institutions with between 11% and 50% blacks on their boards rose very slightly from 16 to 18 institutions. The proportion of black colleges with a majority of blacks on their boards remained at 23%.

The data do lead to the conclusion that the increase in black participation in college governance has taken place outside of the traditionally black institutions.

B. PROPORTION OF FEMALE TRUSTEES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

While not demographically a minority, women have been and still are a minority in their rate of participation in many public activities, including college governance.

In both 1965 and 1970, approximately 48% of all colleges in our study had boards on which women constituted 10% or less of the membership.

TABLE 17

PROPORTION OF FEMALE TRUSTEES, 1965 - 1970, ALL TITLE III SCHOOLS

	0-5%	*6-10%*	*11-25%*	*26-50%*	*51-75%*	*76-100%*	*Blank*
1965/66	124	36	74	17	4	29	47
1970/71	106	50	85	29	14	5	42
			BLACK INSTITUTIONS				
1965/66	19	6	8	1	0	0	14
1970/71	17	8	9	2	0	0	12

In 1965, 27% of all "developing institutions" had boards on which women constituted sizeable minorities between 11% and 50%; five years later the proportion of schools with this characteristic had risen slightly to 34%. There was an actual decrease in the number of "developing institutions" with predominantly female governing boards from about 10% of the total in 1965 to about 6% in 1970. During both years, a large majority of schools with predominantly female governing boards were sectarian colleges (presumably colleges run by Catholic orders). The majority of schools with a proportion of female trustees ranging from 11% to 25% were public institutions in both 1965 and 1970.

Schools with a proportion of female trustees between 11% and 25% tended to be about evenly split among colleges focusing on terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level and colleges offering primarily liberal arts and general curricula in both 1965 and 1970.

Institutions with 11 to 25% of female trustees tended to be primarily located in the Southeast in 1965 and 1970, while schools with predominantly female boards tended to be located in the Plains for both time periods.

Woman's place is definitely not on the governing board of a black "developing institutions." In both 1965 and 1970, over half of the 48 black institutions in our study had 10% or fewer women members on their governing boards. The proportion of schools with sizeable participation of women (between 11% and 50%) rose only slightly from 18% to 23%, and in neither year was there a single black institution in which women constituted a majority on the governing board.

C. ANNUAL NUMBER OF GOVERNING BOARD MEETINGS, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

How effectively can a board govern an institution if it meets infrequently? On the surface, the answer might be "not at all effectively." Nevertheless, a board may operate under a very effective committee system which makes frequent meetings of the whole board unnecessary. We believe, however, that while a board which meets only infrequently may or may not govern effectively, boards that meet often are probably more than marginally involved in governing their institutions. (See Table 18.)

In both 1965 and 1970, the single largest group of institutions had semi-annual or quarterly board meetings (44% of the whole sample). The next largest group of institutions (about 17%) had boards which met every month during both time periods. During both years, the majority of schools reporting semi-annual or quarterly board meetings were sectarian institutions, while the majority of schools reporting monthly board meetings were public institutions.

Among the institutions reporting semi-annual or quarterly meetings, the majority were four-year institutions and colleges offering primarily liberal arts and general programs. The majority of institutions reporting monthly board meetings in both 1965 and 1970 were two-year colleges and schools focusing primarily on terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level.

Black institutions showed the same pattern as the sample of "developing institutions" in general. In both 1965 and 1970, over half of the 48 black institutions held semi-annual or quarterly board meetings, while the next largest number of schools (14%) held monthly board meetings.

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF BOARD MEETINGS YEARLY - ALL RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

	0-1	*2-4*	*5-7*	*8-10*	*11-13*	*14 +*	*Blank*
1965/66	8	148	23	23	59	27	43
1970/71	1	147	40	28	56	28	31
				BLACK COLLEGES			
1965/66	0	28	2	1	7	0	10
1970/71	0	26	4	1	7	0	10

D. PROPORTION OF TRUSTEES LIVING WITHIN 100 MILES OF COLLEGES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

Trustees living close to their institution are presumably more likely to be able to participate in its affairs; also, a trustee appointed living in the vicinity of his college may be more likely to be better informed about his school than his colleague who lives too far away to have a real "feel" for daily issues affecting the school. While an influential and nationally visible trustee may be of more use to a small rural institution than a rural board member, a predominantly non-local board is probably not as likely to take an active and continuous interest in its institution.

In both 1965 and 1970, about 59% of all institutions in the responding institutions had boards the majority of whose members lived within 100 miles of the institution. During both time periods, boards with proportions of local trustees between 11% and 75% were to be found among sectarian colleges, four-year institutions, and schools offering primarily liberal arts and general curricula. Conversely, boards with majorities of local trustees between 76% and 100% were primarily public institutions, two-year colleges, and schools focusing on terminal occupational programs below the bachelor's level.

About 45% of all black institutions in the study reported majorities of local individuals on their boards for both 1965 and 1970. This same trend was also characteristic of non-black Title III institutions.

In terms of number of meetings and geographical spread, boards of trustees of devleoping institutions do not seem to be very different from any other institutions.

CHAPTER 8

FINANCIAL DATA

We had expected budgetary data to add considerably to our knowledge of "developing institutions." Our questionnaire used basically the HEGIS format with its categories for gathering financial information; we assumed that our respondents would find it quite easy to provide us with the desired data, since they could consult their copies of the relevant HEGIS questionnaire. Unfortunately, the response rate to our questions dealing with budgetary information fell considerably below our expectations. Only about 100 institutions filled out the section completely.

Despite the disappointing response rate in general, certain budget categories did yield better-than-average response rates in areas we believe to be vital to the understanding of "developing institutions." The income categories analyzed in this chapter will be: (1) income from foundation grants, (2) income from other private grants, and (3) endowment income. The expenditures categories will be: (4) expenditures for libraries, and (5) expenditures for extension and public services.

We believe the income categories particularly can help us understand some vital aspects of "developing institutions." As the competition for grants from non-governmental sources is quite fierce, institutions that are able to attract such grants have been able to project an image of success to their donors--no funding agency, whether public or private, is interested in hopeless cases. Institutions that attract grants are making vigorous fund-raising efforts which do reflect the aggressiveness of presidential leadership.

To say that "developing institutions" usually have to operate under severe financial constraints is stating the obvious; nevertheless, some schools are better off than others. A number of colleges in our responding institutions did mention endowment income as one of their sources of income. Having an endowment is no mean feat for a "developing institution" and can be interpreted as reflecting some success in financial management.

We believe that the two expenditures variables--expenditures for libraries, and expenditures for extension and public services--are useful in demonstrating the extent to which institutions are willing to improve their academic programs and to serve the surrounding community.

The next section will discuss budget variables (1) to (5) listed on the preceding page in terms of their importance as measures of institutional vitality. This chapter will limit itself to a discussion of changes which occurred between 1965-66 and 1970-71 in these budget variables in different types of schools.

A. INCOME FROM FOUNDATION GRANTS, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

Among the 100 institutions which did provide us with complete data on foundation grants (about 30% of the entire study) only ten had an annual income from foundation grants of between $50,000 and $100,000 in 1965-66. The number of colleges with such grants rose to 16 in 1970-71:

TABLE 19

ANNUAL FOUNDATION GRANTS TO DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	$0-50	*$50-100*	*$100-250*	*$250-500*	*$500-750*	*Over $750*
1965/66	83	10	4	1	0	0
1970/71	98	16	9	4	2	1
			BLACK INSTITUTIONS			
1965/66	5	6	3	0	0	0
1970/71	10	1	2	4	1	1

Almost all institutions with annual foundation grants between $50,000 and $100,000 were four-year institutions, both in 1965-66 and 1970-71. The large majority of these emphasized liberal arts and general programs. Schools with annual foundation grants between $50,000 and $100,000 were equally likely to be located in the Southeast and in the Plains during both 1965-66 and 1970-71.

About 30% of the black institutions provided information on the amounts of foundation monies they received, about the same percentage as the whole respondent group. In 1965, only 3 black institutions received foundation grants of over $100,000, while in 1970 8 institutions were receiving over $100,000. (See Table 19.)

A majority of Title III schools which received foundation grants between $50,000 and $100,000 in both years had enrollments of 1,000 or fewer students.

More interesting than what the institutions reported was what they did not report. From our case study data as well, we are convinced that a number of "developing institutions" received both Title III funds and grants from private foundations. (See also Table 29, pp. 141-142.)

B. INCOME FROM OTHER PRIVATE SOURCES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

We did not provide a detailed explanation for each of the budget positions for which we tried to elicit information; respondents were therefore free to interpret them as they wished. As quite a few institutions did provide the desired data, and as a large number among them reported annual amounts of over $100,000, we assume that "other private support from all sources" includes alumni donations as one of its major components.

TABLE 20

OTHER PRIVATE INCOME
(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	$0-50	*$50-100*	*$100-250*	*$250-500*	*$500-750*	*Over $750*
1965/66	80	37	58	16	1	0
1970/71	65	29	63	41	7	3

Note that the largest increase was among institutions which received donations above $250,000--they rose from 17 in 1965/66 to 51 in 1970/71. Again, the majority of schools reporting donations above $50,000 were sectarian institutions. It comes as no surprise that the majority of institutions receiving more than $50,000 in donations per year were predominantly four-year institutions during both years and those offering liberal arts and general programs as their main curriculum.

During both 1965-66 and 1970-71, institutions reporting donations between $50,000 and $100,000, as well as those reporting donations above $250,000, tended to be located predominantly in the Southeast, while colleges reporting annual donations between $100,000 and $250,000 were slightly more likely to be located in the Plains.

Among the 24 black institutions which did provide us with information on the amounts of private donations they received, an approximately equal number of schools had received donations of various sizes in 1965-66. Five years later, however, a trend toward larger grants began to emerge--60% of the reporting colleges reported that they had received donations in excess of $100,000. This was stronger than in the population of all Title III institutions.

Regardless of the amount of donations received, schools which did furnish us with data on this subject were likely to have enrollments under 1,000 students in both 1965-66 and 1970-71.

C. ENDOWMENT INCOME, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

We assume that "developing institutions" which were skillful enough to build up endowments would anticipate a normal net return for American colleges on these endowments. An annual return of between $50,000 and

$100,000 represents an endowment capital of approximately $1,000,000--which is very small compared to the endowments of large universities but quite respectable for a "developing institution."

A total of 22 institutions reported an annual endowment income of over $100,000 in 1965-66; their number had increased to 34 five years later. In other words, the number of "developing institutions" with endowments worth at least $1,000,000 increased by approximately 50% between 1965-66 and 1970-71.

TABLE 21

ENDOWMENT INCOME, 1965 - 1970
(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	$0-50	$50-100	$100-250	$250-500	$500-750	$1,000 +
1965/66	106	22	15	4	2	1
1970/71	102	26	24	4	4	2

During both years, the large majority of these colleges reporting any endowment income were sectarian institutions, colleges offering four-year programs, and colleges emphasizing liberal arts and general curricula. No really clearcut distribution by region was apparent for either 1965-66 or 1970-71.

Four predominantly black institutions reported annual endowment incomes between $50,000 and $100,000 in 1965-66; the same number reported annual endowment incomes above $100,000. Four others reported higher levels of income. This situation remained unchanged in 1970-71.

Regardless of the size of their annual endowment incomes, the majority of colleges which did provide information on this subject listed their enrollments as being below 1,000 students in both 1965-66 and 1970-71.

D. CURRENT FUND EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARIES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

Twenty-seven of the institutions which provided us with data on library expenditures for 1965-66 (these expenditures do not involve salaries) reported having spent over $100,000 for that purpose during that year. Five years later, 111 institutions reported spending that amount on library expenditures:

TABLE 22

LIBRARY EXPENDITURES
(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	$0-50	*$50-100*	*$100-250*	*$250-500*	*$500-750*
1965/66	196	69	25	2	0
1970/71	77	119	81	24	6

Most of the institutions spending such large amounts on their libraries were public institutions; a majority of schools with annual library expenditures between $100,000 and $250,000 offered programs beyond the baccalaureate in 1965-66. Five years later, most of the institutions spending between $100,000 and $250,000 on their libraries were four-year institutions, while the majority of schools spending between $250,000 and $500,000 on their libraries were institutions offering programs beyond the baccalaurate level. The biggest spenders in terms of their expenditures for libraries were thus "complex" institutions offering advanced programs during both 1965-66 and 1970-71; the level of spending on libraries in these institutions increased considerably over the five-year period. During both years, the majority of institutions reporting such large library expenditures were located in the Southeast.

Twelve black institutions reported spending over $100,000 on their libraries in 1965-66; five years later, that number had more than doubled to 25 institutions. The number of large institutions with over 1,000 students which spent over $100,000 on their libraries in 1965-66 was 25; it more than tripled to 81 within five years. It does appear that libraries of developing institutions were systematically upgraded during the period, although not from Title III funds.

E. CURRENT FUND EXPENDITURES FOR EXTENSION AND PUBLIC SERVICES, 1965/66 AND 1970/71

A total of 13 institutions reported spending between $50,000 and $100,000 on extension and public service in 1965-66, and eight institutions reported spending over $100,000 for that purpose during that year. Five years later, the situation had changed dramatically. While the number of colleges reporting extension and public services expenditures between $50,000 and $100,000 grew to 20, the number of institutions reporting expenditures over $100,000 for that purpose had grown to 33. Institutions reporting increased expenditures for extension and public services were primarily public colleges. The majority of the few colleges reporting extension expenditures between $50,000 and $100,000 for 1965-66 were four-year colleges; five years later, the largest group of institutions in this spending category were two-year institutions. In both 1965-66 and 1970-71, the majority of institutions spending between $50,000 and $100,000 on extension and public services were colleges stressing primarily liberal arts and general curricula.

Whereas only three predominantly black institutions reported spending over $100,000 on extension and public service programs in 1965-66, that number had grown to ten five years later.

A slight majority of those institutions spending between $50,000 and $100,000 on extension and public services programs in 1965-66 were colleges with enrollments under 1,000 students. Five years later, the majority of institutions spending such amounts on extension programs were colleges with enrollments over 1,000 students.

A summary of the most important findings on the financial data we received reveals that:

(a) Our respondents were most reluctant to release information on foundation grants which had been received by their institutions in 1965-66 and 1970-71.

(b) Between 1965-66 and 1970-71, sectarian institutions as a group seem to have done particularly well in increasing the number of large grants they received.

(c) Between 1965-66 and 1970-71, there was an important increase in the number of black institutions which received large grants (over $100,000 per year) from private foundations.

(d) While well-endowed institutions (with endowments valued over $1,000,000) are probably still a small minority among our group of "developing institutions," their number did rise significantly between 1965-66 and 1970-71.

(e) The number of institutions reporting annual library expenditures (excluding salaries) in excess of $100,000 grew dramatically between 1965-66 and 1970-71, probably due to large amounts of federal and private funds earmarked for that purpose during that period.

(f) Colleges with post-baccalaureate programs are probably the group showing the single most marked increase in library expenditures during the five-year period.

(g) Black institutions show a major increase for library expenditures between 1965-66 and 1970-71.

(h) There were many more large-size (over $100,000 per year) extension and public services programs in 1970-71 than in 1965-66, especially among black institutions.

CHAPTER 9

SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS OF TITLE III INSTITUTIONS

In terms of control, the institutions in our questionnaire survey are not spectacularly different from the nation as a whole--about half are public, the other half private, many of the public institutions are two-year with specialization in technical vocational programs, while the private institutions are heavily in liberal arts. Of the 48 black institutions in our study, about half are also public. However, the black institutions have a heavier concentration in liberal arts.

By size, Title III institutions have crossed over the "1,000 student gap" between 1965 and 1970. The smaller schools tend to be in technical-vocational areas, the larger ones in four-year and graduate liberal arts. During our time period, the black institutions moved past the 1,000 student mark much faster than did the rest of our institutions.

There was a marked increase in the number of low-income students in developing institutions from 1965 to 1970, either because of a change in institutions selected for Title III grants or an increase in low-income students from the same institutions. A shift in institutions with heavy enrollments from low-income students has occurred, from the Southeast to the Plains. The black institutions, always heavy in enrollments of low-income students, have slightly increased their proportion of low-income students.

Title III programs have been given overwhelmingly to institutions with large numbers of black students; other minorities have not been very well represented in Title III schools. Black student enrollment levels are now higher in two-year and in public institutions, while sectarian colleges have not shown much increase in numbers of black students enrolled. With the exception of the two-year colleges, "developing institutions" enroll sizeable numbers of out-of-state students. Four-year colleges (including most of our black institutions) are heavily residential, while two-year programs are commuter, as in the rest of American higher education. More students are being graduated from Title III institutions, again following a trend nationally.

Most white Title III institutions have had very few black faculty members, although a few have shown increases. Black institutions tend to have diversified somewhat, and have added some whites to the previously all-black faculties. Overall, blacks have never been more than a very small percentage of most non-black "developing institutions." More faculty members at "developing institutions" now have their doctorate, particularly at black institutions. Title III institutions seem to have shown a marked increase in younger faculty at the lower ranks, which should increase their flexibility. Faculty members tended to be concentrated in the humanities area. With the exception of two-year institutions, most institutions increased their proportion of teachers in the humanities from 1965 to 1970.

As with all of higher education, the number of administrators in Title III institutions is growing, especially in four-year institutions and in the black colleges. This means increased specialization of administrative functions also. With the exception of Catholic women's colleges, Title III institutions have few female administrators. The number of administrators with advanced degrees has also increased, particularly in the black colleges. Relatively few Title III institutions employed large numbers of part-time administrators who also taught. Black institutions still make slightly greater use of such part-time administrators than do the rest of the sample.

Trustees in "developing institutions" are overwhelmingly white and male. There has been a slight trend to increase representation, but it is not shared by the black colleges. There tend to be only slightly more black trustees and even fewer women trustees in black institutions. However, in terms of national norms, the representation of women and minorities may be somewhat better in Title III institutions than the rest. Most of our boards met either quarterly or semi-annually, with a smaller minority meeting monthly, mainly public institutions at the two-year level. About 60% of our boards were primarily made up of individuals living within 100 miles of the institution.

We encountered some reluctance to release financial data, particularly on income generated from foundation grants. However, it was clear that sectarian and black colleges have both shown sizeable increases in grants of over $100,000 a year from private foundations. We also found an increased number of "developing institutions" with endowments of over $1,000,000. There was a marked increase in the number of Title III institutions with annual library expenditures over $100,000 a year. Black institutions showed strong gains in library expenditures during our period, 1965-66 to 1970-71. We also noted an increase in the number of extension and public services programs of over $100,000 a year.

SOME INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY

INTRODUCTION

While the other parts of this report deal with the development of "developing institutions" during the late sixties and early seventies, this part attempts to re-examine some of the data for future use through the development of indicators of institutional vitality which may help in the selection of institutions for the expanded Title III program.

The selection criteria used by the Division of College Support in choosing Title III institutions seem to have been based on a few objective criteria and much subjective judgement. The objective criteria, such as data from enrollment figures on students from ethnic minorities and from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, tended to supplement the basic requirements for eligibility outlined in the original Title III/1965 HEA legislation. The two together established the lowest cutting level for colleges applying for Title III funds.

The plan for an expanded Title III program with its emphasis on the development of special pre-professional programs will require different selection criteria since it is based on the assumption that the original general institutional support approach of Title III has been effective in bringing at least a number of "developing institutions" closer to the "mainstream" of American higher education. Major weaknesses in the academic program, as well as in the administrative structure and in student services, are supposed to have been corrected. Thus, while the expanded Title III program does not assume that institutions which have been improved in this way have become fully "developed," it nevertheless assumes that their development potential is greater. The crucial question remaining for the agency is to decide where an institution is located on the continuum ranging from "undeveloped" to "developed." The indicators for locating with reasonable certainty an institution on this continuum remain uncertain.

This time limitation did not allow us to develop indicators of institutional vitality in a systematic way by testing their validity and reliability empirically. Rather, we decided to use the few months to develop indicators that seemed to be conceptually valid and reliable. To develop these indicators, we re-interpreted data presented in other parts of this report which had been gathered with two of our three instruments, the questionnaire and the checklist for interviewers. Furthermore, we used our personal observations on the campuses of "developing institutions" as well as some of the existing literature on the subjects of development and institutional vitality.

We do not pretend that our indicators will be applicable to all institutions being considered for extended Title III support. Though we have gained an amount of insight into "developing institutions" and their problems, our experience with them has been basically second-hand, and because of this, we may have overlooked some important indicators or presented some which may prove to be of little use when applied to actual institutions.

We would also stress that this part of the report is not intended to verify propositions advanced by the authors and by others; in this sense, it is not a scholarly paper. Rather, we see it as a practical guide for persons who have to make selection decisions, whether they are examining a funding proposal in Washington or trying to assess an institution's vitality on the spot during a site visit.

CHAPTER 10

A THEORETICAL OUTLINE

There are two dimensions in which we are particularly interested--(1) stages of development and (2) institutional vitality. In our attempt to define the point at which an institution should have become "developed" enough to benefit from special Title III funds for pre-professional programs, it was natural that W. W. Rostow's economic growth stages model should be chosen as a framework on which to base our concept of stages of institutional development. The use of the social-psychological concepts of institutional vitality for aggregate bodies--such as colleges--seemed to be the most adequate approach to guide us in defining individual indicators. We are also indebted to JB Lon Hefferlin's The Dynamics of Academic Reform.

A. THE STAGES OF INSTITUTIONAL GROWTH

In his classic work, *The Stages of Economic Growth,* W. W. Rostow developed a growth model applicable to large social systems (such as nation-states), using both economic and social indicators. Rostow perceives five distinct stages (or phases) of economic growth: (1) *the traditional society,* predominantly based on agriculture and in which family and clan connections play a large role in social organization; (2) *the pre-conditions for take-off*, the period in which the rational basis for later economic expansion is laid and in which the nation-state first emerges; (3) *the take-off*, where technological innovations and changes in the social structure lay the groundwork for industrialization; (4) *the drive to maturity*, during which the process of industrialization is completed and in which "an economy demonstrates the capacity to move beyond the original industries which powered its take-off"; and (5) *the age of high mass-consumption*, a term which is close in meaning to what others have labelled "post-industrial society".

Rostow's model of economic development has become both controversial and widely quoted largely because of his addition of stages 2 and 3--the pre-conditions for take-off, and the take-off itself the dynamics of which constituted an addition to common economic and social theory. It is this aspect of the model which also most interests us and from which we have borrowed for our own model of the stages of development of developing institutions.

While colleges are by no means self-contained societies, they are nevertheless fairly complex aggregates of individuals with widely differing characteristics. If theories of complex organizations have so far failed to explain the functioning of colleges and universities it may be due to the complexity of these institutions. Colleges and universities that have reached a certain size are quite possibly examined more profitably in terms of small societies than in terms of large complex organizations.

In "developing institutions" the equivalents for the first four stages of Rostow's model are as follows:

1. *Traditional society.*	Institutions which may or may not have received some small amount of Title III funds for general institutional support. (In other words, institutions on which this type of Title III funding hasn't had a noticeable impact.)
2. *Pre-conditions for take-off.*	After a sustained period of Title III funding for general institutional support, the college is at least *potentially* ready for special Title III suport, since its major areas of deficiency have been improved.
3. *Take-off.*	The institution is not only potentially but *actually* ready to receive and benefit from special Title III funds. The school exhibits certain characteristics (e.g., initiative in starting a pre-professional program on its own) which make it a real candidate for special Title III funding.
4. *Drive to maturity.*	The instituion has been given a special Title III grant and is well on its way to having established viable pre-professional programs.

Stage (4) is really beyond our scope, since we are solely concerned with those stages preceding the actual granting of special Title III funds. We mention this stage only to show what the analogy between a society and a "developing institution" might be while it completes industrialization or implements a Title III-financed pre-professional program.

An institution which has reached the pre-condition for take-off stage--that is, which has received a full cycle of Title III funding for general institutional support, is potentially ready to receive Title III funds for special program purposes. However, an institution which received a full cycle of general institutional support funds under Title III fulfills only the necessary condition for being given special grants--an equivalent sum of money for similar programs may have brought one institution to the point where its chances for setting up a special program are very high, while another college may be virtually unchanged after having received general support funds.

As in Rostow's theory, there is a fine line between pre-conditions for take-off and take-off itself (the two have very often been lumped together) in "developing institutions"; there is a fine line between colleges which have the potential for successful use of special Title III funds and colleges which are actually low-risk choices because they have demonstrated in some way that they are good choices. Our subsequent discussion will center on how to distinguish between institutions which fulfill only the necessary conditions, and those which fulfill both the necessary and sufficient conditions for implementing successful pre-professional programs.

B. THE CONCEPT OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY

Now that we have defined the stages at which an institution may be considered eligible for special Title III funds, we can focus on defining indicators of institutional vitality which will determine whether or not a "developing institution" has reached the stage of either potential or actual readiness for special program funding.

In *Dynamics of Academic Reform* JB Lon Hefferlin has dealt extensively with the concept of institutional vitality. He states that while the goals of all institutions of higher education are basically conservative, colleges and universities need to have mechanisms that help them absorb change (p. 4). However, academic institutions are deliberately structured to resist sudden change (p. 16).

Based on the analysis of extensive questionnaire data collected in a large number of "developed" institutions, Hefferlin focused primarily on the agents of change and the academic areas in which they could effect or force change. Not surprisingly, Hefferlin found that there is a hierarchy of agents of change in terms of the scope of change they can initiate themselves or help initiate. Proceeding from the group with least influence to the group with most influence, Hefferlin lists the agents of change as:

1. The scope of *students'* influence in the academic area is limited to forcing the institution to add new courses to the curriculum.
2. The scope of *faculty* influence extends to setting up new programs of study.

3. The scope of *administrative* influence extends to adding new units (departments, divisions, schools).
4. Only the *board of trustees* can make decisions which may alter the entire status of the institution. (P. 79)

Hefferlin points out that the most dynamic institutions are those in which the four groups actually use their potential influence to effect changes in those areas where they can press for change. Since changes have to be initiated by some individual or some group, identifying the "advocate" becomes a vital task (p. 141).

Hefferlin found his "advocates" among all groups on campus, and he found that the most dynamic institutions were those in which the "advocates" had made the existence of one or more of the following conditions possible:

"1. There existed a market for ideas on campus.
2. There existed new models needed for emulation.
3. New ideas did circulate widely.
4. There were 'marginal' (and non-conformist) individuals on campus who were likely to act as 'advocates.'
5. There were enough new individuals on campus to make major changes possible.
6. The institution was able to retain the 'right' people.
7. Initiative was decentralized.
8. A patriarchal system of decision-making had been avoided.
9. A collegial consensus system of decision-making had been avoided.

10. The college had instituted an 'avuncular' system of decision-making." (Pp. 154-181)

We accept Hefferlin's basic assumptions about the scope of authority of the different groups on campus, and we believe that locating "advocates" is an important task in evaluating the viability of an institution for special Title III funding. We think, however, that few of Hefferlin's ten conditions characterizing dynamic institutions will be found on the campuses of "developing institutions." Based on our case studies, we are convinced that "developing institutions" have a different and more patriarchal style of presidential leadership than the more "developed" institutions, which have more elaborate internal structures (and better developed checks and balances). While a very assertive and authoritarian style of leadership may not lead to changes if the president wants to maintain the status quo, such a style may be a definite asset if the president is willing to change his institution.

Although Hefferlin's work did not provide us with either useful dimensions or useful indicators to assess an institution's "vitality," it did help us focus on the general concept of vitality as such. More important than Hefferlin's work in helping us think about operational indicators of institutional vitality has been Richard E. Peterson's *Institutional Functioning Inventory* (both the instrument itself as well as the accompanying technical literature). The IFI will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 11

USE AND INTERPRETATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE DATA (*IFI* ITEMS)

While our main concern during the process of questionnaire construction was with gathering census-type data on "developing institutions," we were already interested in how to measure institutional vitality. Our close cooperation with the Educational Testing Service office in Berkeley led us to consider modifying some of the *Institutional Functioning Inventory* items developed by Richard E. Peterson and his associates.

The IFI is an instrument with pre-coded multiple-choice attitude questions on various aspects of a college or university. The instrument can be completed by respondents from all groups on campus; it assumes that different groups will perceive different aspects of the institution in different ways. The instrument consists of 132 items and yields scores on 11 dimensions or scales, each comprised of 12 items. Each dimension is a composite index of one major aspect of institutional vitality.

Of the eleven scales, we were particularly interested in the following four:

1. *Human Diversity*. The degree to which the faculty and student body are heterogeneous in their backgrounds and present attitudes (2 items).

2. *Concern for Improvement of Society.* The desire among people at the institution to apply their knowledge and skills in solving social problems and prompting social change in America (1 item).
3. *Self-Study and Planning.* The importance which college leaders attach to continuous long-range planning for the total institution, and to institutional research needed in formulating and revising plans (2 items).
4. *Concern for Innovation.* The strength of institutional commitment to experimentation with new ideas for educational practice (3 items).

We arbitrarily decided to limit the number of items in our questionnaire because we feared that our respondents would balk at being asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire with too many attitude items. We realize that by so doing we have lost the power of the IFI scales. Nevertheless, our item analysis served a useful purpose. The wording of our questions usually approximated the wording of the questions in the IFI, but we introduced different response categories. While the IFI instrument has both yes/no and multiple-choice response categories, we introduced only yes/no categories for all our items. Our items were in the first part of the questionnaire, and we specifically asked the institution's president to complete them. The IFI should only be considered a source of ideas for our items; we did not use the instrument directly in any way.

We eventually dropped one of the items because we felt from pretesting that the answers were ambiguous; this left us with the following seven items:

1. There is a general feeling that most things at this college are all right as they are [indicator of concern for innovation].
2. There is a long-range plan for the institution that is embodied in a written document for distribution throughout the college [indicator of the importance attached to self-study and planning].
3. Currently, there is a wide discussion and debate on this campus about what the institution will or should be seeking to accomplish five or ten years from now [indicator of the importance attached to self-study and planning].
4. There is a general willingness here to experiment with innovations that have shown promise at other institutions [indicator of concern for innovation].
5. One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to try to select students with fairly similar personality traits [indicator of the importance attached to human diversity].
6. One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to hire faculty with fairly similar

ideas [indicator of the importance attached to human diversity].

7. In the last few years, there have been a number of major departures from old ways of doing things at this institution [indicator of concern for innovation].

We theorized that the following replies to our seven questions would correlate with achievement of the "take-off" stage.

Question 1 -- No
Question 2 -- Yes
Question 3 -- Yes
Question 4 -- Yes
Question 5 -- No
Question 6 -- No
Question 7 -- Yes

A college which is trying to obtain a special Title III grant should not appear to be complacent, but should do a certain amount of soulsearching (questions 1 and 3). Such an institution should have gone through some significant changes in the last few years and ought to show an interest in innovations (questions 4 and 7). Institutional self-knowledge should have a high priority (question 2). Finally, a college aspiring to initiate new Title III-financed programs should value diversity in both its faculty and its student body (questions 5 and 6).

Of the 325 respondents who replied to the seven questions, a majority replied as expected to each of the questions. However, the distribution of "yes" and "no" responses showed considerable variations between questions:

	Yes	*No*
Question 1. "Most things at college all right."	43%	57%
Question 2. "Long-range plan exists."	56%	44%
Question 3. "Wide discussion on future."	73%	27%
Question 4. "Willing to experiment with innovations."	92%	8%
Question 5. "Try to select similar student personalities."	5%	95%
Question 6. "Have faculty with similar ideas."	20%	80%
Question 7. "Major departures recently."	87%	13%

If we can assume that presidents' replies to these items do indeed reflect the institutional climate (we have no proof, since the questionnaire was not submitted to other respondents on campus), we might infer that very sizeable minorities of "developing institutions" (like their presidents) are quite complacent and do not attach much importance to self-study and planning (or do not have the resources to do so).

It should be stressed that we only used IFI-derived items in a new way. In no sense did we use any of the IFI scales, and our results are limited to only presidents filling out only a few items. It may be that presidents are not representative of campus attitudes, but these data we thought were interesting in themselves. The IFI requires significant numbers of returns from faculty, students and administrators before the scale scores can be used.

While the responses to our seven items would seem to indicate that "developing institutions" show a rather high degree of institutional vitality, we believe that the results would have been much more conclusive if we had been able to have large groups complete the entire IFI. We would suggest that the instrument be submitted to appropriate numbers of students, faculty and administrators on each campus which applies for special Title III grants for the purpose of establishing pre-professional programs. This might be done in a few Title III institutions by Developing Institutions staff for comparative purposes.

CHAPTER 12

USE AND INTERPRETATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE DATA (LONGITUDINAL CENSUS-TYPE DATA)

Although attitudinal data such as responses from presidents to some IFI items are one source of information on institutional vitality, attitudinal data alone cannot provide enough information on which to base policy-making decisions such as whether or not a college should be given a special grant. Such information, we believe, must be supplemented by data on student characteristics, faculty characteristics, characteristics of administrators and trustees, and budgetary information. Furthermore, this type of data should be longitudinal so as to make possible assessments of institutional growth over time.

A. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON STUDENT DATA

How attractive is an institution to prospective freshmen? Once the student enrolls, how likely is the institution to retain him until he graduates? If a college does attract a student and holds on to him until he graduates, it may be called "successful" in this limited sense. Readers should take this measure with several grains of salt, as low attrition may simply mean that students are being entertained without learning anything. On the other hand, if no entering students complete the program, we can make some negative statements with more force. We would argue that holding power to graduation is one limited indicator of institutional viability and vitality.

We tried to measure the attractiveness of our study institutions to prospective students by asking respondents a series of three related questions:

1. How many applicants for admission on all levels (first-time registrants only) did your college *receive* for the first terms of the academic years 1965-66 and 1970-71?
2. How may applicants on all levels (first-time registrants only) did your college *admit*--regardless of whether they actually enrolled--for the first terms of the academic years 1965-66 and 1970-71?
3. How may applicants on all levels (first-time registrants only) *actually enrolled* at your institution in the fall of the academic years 1965-66 and 1970-71?

The fewer prospective students an institution loses between the time a student sends in his application and the time he actually enrolls, the more successful the institution has been in attracting new students.

The higher the ratio of first-time students who actually enrolled to first-time students who sent in their application, the more attractive the institution.

The question "What proportion of an original freshman class was graduated from your institution during the academic years 1965-66 and 1970-71?" can yield interesting information. We can state the following proposition with the cautions already given:

> The larger the increase in the proportion of an original freshman class to a graduating class over time, the more successful the institution.

In an era in which large number of private liberal arts colleges are losing students to public institutions, a private institution able to maintain its enrollment in the face of stiff competition from nearby public institutions is certainly successful. Increases in the enrollments of public institutions have been common during the last few years. Since many of the private colleges have to struggle, probably more than public ones to maintain their enrollment, we can state the following:

> Private institutions located in urban areas where they face stiff competition from public institutions

> in attracting students are successful if they succeed in maintaining their enrollment at approximately the same level over time, or in increasing their enrollment.

In assessing an institution's vitality, perhaps more important than the growth (or maintainance) of enrollment over time is the growth (or decline) of graduates over time. The number of graduates is often the only tangible output a small college can produce:

> If the ratio of graduates to total full-time enrollment increases over time, the institution has increased its productivity and demonstrated its utility and vitality.

The Division of College Support already routinely considers the numbers of low-income and minority students as important criteria in deciding whether or not an institution is basically eligible for a Title III grant:

> The larger the proportional increase in low-income and minority student enrollment, the more socially conscious an institution.

An increasingly large number of urban, two-year colleges located in areas inhabited by large proportions of low-income and/or minority populations have changed their status from formerly predominantly white junior colleges to integrated community colleges which offer much broader programs and serve the community much better than before. There exist some community colleges in which the racial balance is shifting toward predominantly non-white enrollments. There are also the less spectacular cases of private liberal arts colleges which have made conscious efforts to attract minority students and have managed to double or triple their minority enrollment within a relatively short time. We believe that both types of institutions demonstrate a responsiveness to local needs and can often be considered dynamic in their approach to solving local problems. We thus believe that schools with important increases in low-income and minority student enrollments should be considered for special Title III grants, even though this social consciousness may create problems.

B. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON FACULTY DATA

The composition of the faculty in a dynamic institution is likely to have undergone some changes during the past few years. The following changes reflect progressive hiring policies:

(a) Increases in the proportion of women on faculties, particularly women with full-time teaching appointments and women in senior faculty positions (excluding fields which have traditionally been women's preserves, such as home economics and physical education for women).

(b) Increases in the proportion of full-time faculty members from ethnic minorities (or, in the case of institutions with all-black faculties, increases in the proportion of full-time white faculty members who may bring with them expertise and contacts useful to the institution).

(c) Increases in the proportion of young faculty members with full-time appointments.

(d) Increases in the proportion of junior faculty with full-time appointments. In schools in which the majority of the faculty are tenured, young (and presumably more innovative) faculty will not stay on, because opportunities for advancement are scarce.

(e) Increases in the proportion of full-time faculty with earned doctorates.

(f) Decreases in the proportion of faculty who are alumni of the institution at which they teach.

The practice of hiring alumni as faculty members seems to have remained constant and is found primarily in sectarian four-year liberal arts colleges while the proportion of alumni on the faculties of black institutions has actually increased between 1965-66 and 1970-71. We are not sure what this means. Perhaps more qualified black faculty are now becoming available, and the desire to return to one's "home campus" may be very great for them.

C. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON ADMINISTRATOR DATA

Background characteristics of full-time administrators are not likely to have changed as much as faculty characteristics during the past few years even in progressive institutions. Nevertheless, changes may have taken place in the following areas:

(a) Increases in the proportion of women among full-time administrators. (This might not, however, be interpreted as a sign of greater vitality in schools in which women have traditionally comprised the majority of full-time administrators.)

(b) Increases in the proportion of minority group members among full-time administrators. (This is not a valid indicator of greater institutional vitality in traditionally black colleges; however, large increases in minority administrators in urban two-year colleges with large minority enrollments may be interpreted as a sign of greater vitality.)

(c) Increases in the proportion of younger full-time administrators with better credentials than their older peers. (The increasing number of training programs for college administrators might already be reflected in an increase in the number of young administrators with specialized advanced degrees, although we believe that it is the "developed"

> rather than the "developing" institutions which
> are going to absorb these specialists.)

The number of administrators can not be used as an indicator of either greater or lesser institutional vitality unless its correlates are known. There are still a few institutions which are so small and undifferentiated that the president is the sole professional administrator. At the other end of the spectrum are institutions with top-heavy administrations in which the administrative division of labor has been pushed to unnecessary extremes in relation to the relative complexity of the institution as a whole.

More important than the number of full-time administrators in assessing the vitality of an institution is the degree of professionalization of the administrative structure. While most institutions do have full-time administrators to carry out the traditional tasks--such as those carried out by the dean of students, the registrar, the comptroller, etc.--many good-sized colleges still do not have the "new" type of office which deals with questions of long-term development, such as a development (or fund-raising) office, an office of institutional studies, and a planning office. We believe that the existence of such offices reflects the institution's desire to plan ahead, which we have taken as an indicator of institutional viability and vitality (see discussion on pages 93-105).

D. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON TRUSTEE DATA

Since the trustees are often the single most important group in affecting an institution's whole status, changes in the composition of the governing board can have far-reaching consequences. These are the areas in which we feel changes may contribute to greater institutional vitality:

(a) Increases in the proportion of minority group members. (We feel this is an indicator of vitality for both white boards and for black institutions with traditionally white "missionary" boards.)

(b) Increases in the proportion of women trustees.

(c) Increases in full student representation on governing boards.

(d) Increases in alumni representation on boards of trustees.

(e) Increases in the diversity of professional backgrounds of board members.

(f) Increases in the educational level of trustees. (Many boards of smaller institutions still have members who have not themselves been college students and who may consequently find it difficult to really understand their institution.)

(g) Increases in the number of meetings of the full board, or, if the board only meets once or twice a year, increases in the number of meetings of the board's standing committees. (While greater trustee involvement may in some cases reflect weak presidential leadership, it is more likely to reflect greater interest in their institution on the part of the trustees, brought about by an increasing number and scope of problems.)

(h) Increases in the number of "cosmopolitan" trustees who live far away from the institution and who have useful contacts. (While some colleges have discovered that their "cosmopolitan" trustees may be less useful than expected, especially if they are "public figures" who have too many conflicting commitments and who can not devote much time to their trustee roles, the greater scope of non-local trustees is more often helpful.)

While our data on trustees shows a slight increase in the diversification of governing bodies, the trend towards diversification is still in its infancy.

E. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON BUDGET INFORMATION

Many developing institutions receive grants from many different sources, both public and private. Some Title III institutions are comparable to large universities in their success in getting grants. The very fact that these institutions are able to compete successfully for funds with other colleges might, in some cases, indicate that their entrepreneurial skills might make them eligible to become recipients of special Title III funds for programs which are more difficult to administer and implement than the traditional general institutional programs funded under Title III.

We believe that it is of particular importance for USOE to analyze the membership of consortia more closely than they have in the past. Membership in a consortium is the one way in which a "developed" institution can obtain Title III funds, and our case studies indicate that some very developed institutions may have been using funds which might have been of greater marginal utility had they been spent by genuine "developing institutions" (see case study section).

The following are the areas in which changes may be significant and may contribute to greater institutional vitality:

(a) Increases in the amounts of foundation monies received. (A second, related, factor to consider may be the change of funding sources over time.)

(b) Increases in the amounts of other monies received from private sources. (Monies in this category are mostly private donations from alumni and other non-foundation sources. While the president is often the most instrumental person in obtaining foundation grants, other contributions from private sources are more likely to have been received as a result of an active fund-raising policy by on- or off-campus professional fund-raisers.)

(c) Increases in the volume of endowment income. (Some institutions receiving Title III funds have reported annual endowment incomes of $500,000 or more, sums which represent very sizeable endowments. The mere fact that an institution receives an annual endowment income worth reporting may reflect on its relative sophistication in financial matters.)

(d) Increases in library expenditures (excluding salaries) over the last few years. (Such increases probably indicate that the college was able to obtain outside funds to supplement its own library allocation. Much of the support may have come through Title VII of the 1965 Higher Education Act.)

(e) Increases in public services expenditures for extension programs and related community services.

We believe that our five budgetary income indicators listed above reflect, at least to a limited extent, an institution's astuteness in managing its financial affairs, a prerequsite to reaching the "take-off" point in development. The two expenditures variables are indicators of institutional priorities; increases in library expenditures reflect the institution's concern with the quality of its academic program, and increases in public services expenditures reflect the institution's concern with its service to the surrounding community. Again, these indicators are primarily offered here as suggestive rather than definitive.

CHAPTER 13

SOME THOUGHTS ON INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON FIRST-HAND OBSERVATIONS*

As was mentioned in the methodology section, a checklist aimed at supplementing interview data was collected by interviewers during site visits to 45 institutions. Information was collected on physical characteristics of the campus, faculty characteristics, student characteristics, and characteristics of administrators. These categories are similar to the questionnaire categories since we aimed at complementing census-type data with observational data on the same subject. We intrude the site visit data here to complete our discussion of institutional vitality.

A. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON OBSERVED PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CAMPUS

In general, we tried to find out whether facilities were adequate for the needs of the institution. We realize that a first-rate physical plant in itself says very little about institutional vitality; however, if observations on the maintenance of that plant are included, the relationship may be clearer. For example, our interviewers visited campuses with very antiquated physical plants (indicating that the institution was truly "struggling") but with a rather high quality of

---

maintenance. This level of maintenance might be interpreted as an effort to do as well as possible despite serious handicaps--an attitude which certainly does reflect institutional commitment and vitality.

B. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON OBSERVED FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

We gathered much information on faculty morale, faculty interest in students, faculty concern for teaching, faculty awareness of campus issues, nature of faculty-administration relations, competence of faculty, and faculty attitudes toward counseling.

We believe that high faculty morale, much faculty interest in students, serious faculty concern for teaching, and widespread faculty awareness of campus issues should be interpreted as indicators of a high level of institutional vitality. The competence of faculty is very difficult to judge from the outside, and the quality of faculty-administration relations takes more time to assess in any valid manner than our interviewers had.

Reliability and validity of our measures and corresponding observations were not systematically ascertained. We did find, however, that our interviewers' inferences about the same observation were similar.

C. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON OBSERVED CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

"Student morale" was the most abstract of the concepts we explored using the checklist. Nevertheless, this was the single most interesting item. Since many of our interviewers conducted both panel interviews and personal interviews with students, they were usually able to define the quality of student morale without much difficulty and with high levels of agreement. We believe student morale should be considered a central indicator of institutional vitality--contrary to all other groups on campus, students have no vested interests to defend against outsiders; student morale thus may reflect the "state of the institution" better than any other single variable.

D. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY BASED ON OBSERVED CHARACTERISTICS OF ADMINISTRATORS

This is among the most difficult areas for which to obtain valid observational data. "Administrative competence" is more difficult to assess for a short-time visitor than, say, "faculty competence," probably because the site visitors were persons who may have been more familiar with faculty characteristics than with, say, the tasks to be performed by a controller. Communications between administrators also tend to be more formal than between faculty and are therefore more difficult to evaluate.

However, we believe that at least in some cases the observer knows without any doubt whether or not an administrator is "competent," even if the interviewer knows very little about the administrator's task. If we had to redesign the checklist for a second administration, we would probably try to develop different measures to get at the general character of the administration.

CHAPTER 14

INDICATORS AND INSTITUTIONAL VIABILITY

This is the first time we have used the concept of "viability." While our discussion has so far centered around an attempt to present and define conceptually and empirically valid indicators of institutional *vitality*, we did not comment on how to help a person who has to select institutions for special Title III grants. We feel that the task of defining "viability" is up to the policy-maker who selects from among the "vitality" indicators and decides which ones, and how many, to use. In discussing the various indicators of institutional vitality, we have assumed that the modified Rostow model will be used by the policy-maker as follows:

1. The institution at the *traditional society* stage (which may or may not have received a very modest amount of Title III funding for general institutional support) obviously has not benefitted from Title III support long enough to demonstrate any impact. Thus, this type of institution if judged

worthy of support, is a likely candidate for a full cycle of general institutional support under Title III.

2. The institution at the pre-conditions for take-off stage has received a full cycle of general institutional support funding and should at least be potentially ready for special Title III funds. Previous Title III funding may or may not have prepared the institution to reach the actual take-off stage. The decision is likely to be to (a) terminate funds for this particular institution, or (b) consider it a high-risk case and provide it with special Title III funds to start a pre-professional program.
3. The institution at the take-off stage is clearly the ideal recipient for special Title III grants since it has already initiated some special programs of its own.

In the case of Institution (1) the funding decision will be clear; the institution is by definition not eligible for special Title III funds. Institution (3) is probably quite easy to locate also--if any of the indicators discussed earlier are used, the institution is likely to rank high according to each indicator. It is Institution (2) where the question of viability will be most difficult to solve; as a high-risk recipient of special Title III funds, there is a relatively high probability that the new program will fail or stagnate.

We believe that we cannot at this point define how to interpret any measure of vitality applied to Institution (2). The policy-maker will have to decide what weight to assign to each indicator, and which ones among the large number discussed in the previous chapters to select. There is no way to predict how an institution of the second type will score--it may score high on some measures and low on others, or it may obtain an average score on all measures chosen.

This part of the report is more of the "how-to-think-about-it" than of the "how-to-do-it" variety since we cannot develop measures in the abstract. We hope the staging model will prove interesting and useful to policy makers.

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF TITLE III,

1965-66 to 1970-71

INTRODUCTION

Between fiscal year 1965-66 and fiscal year 1970-71 approximately one quarter billion dollars were spent under Title III for general institutional support in a broad range of areas.

What has been the impact of these funds on the approximately 650 institutions--nearly a quarter of all institutions of higher education in the United States--which have, at some point, received Title III funds? To what uses were these funds put? How effectively were these funds used? This section of the report will try to answer these questions.

Our examination of use and impact of Title III funds will be based on aggregate data from questionnaire responses furnished by 325 "developing institutions." We asked for three different types of Title III-related data:

- financial data on sums allocated internally by institutions or consortia for various programs,
- a narrative on the use of these funds, and
- an assessment by the institution itself of the usefulness of Title III-funded programs.

In view of the fact that institutions could apply for Title III funds under three different funding statuses--participating institution, direct-grant institution, and consortium--we decided to examine data on each of the three funding statuses separately. Funding status quite often determines both the scope and the character of a program within an institution. We begin with some basic summary data, which will be followed by separate chapters on use and impact of Title III on consortia, direct-grant institutions, and participating institutions.

The following tables summarize the responses from the 325 institutions in terms of moneys awarded them via Title III (Tables 23 and 24) and their impressions of the programs that were most helpful to them (Table 25) and most successful (Tables 26, 27, and 28). These tables should be useful to the reader at various places in the text, and we place them together here for easy reference. The chapters on direct-grant, participating, and consortia institutions each begin with summary tables for that area.

TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS AWARDED
AND INSTITUTIONAL JUDGEMENTS
OF "MOST SUCCESSFUL" PROGRAMS

COMMENTS ON THE SUMMARY TABLES

By and large, we have concentrated on the institution's judgements of "most successful" programs rather than those in which Title III was "most helpful" primarily because many of the "most helpful" ratings were simply because the funds existed and no other funding source was available. The judgements of success, on the other hand, mean a little more. (Incidentally, we were able, through the case study data, to provide another vantage point which generally supported the institution's judgement as to which programs were the most effective.) Note that the totals here are larger than for the financial data. Institutions were more willing to tell us about programs than about money.

As can be seen in Table 23, the largest grant category was in faculty development, with 1,501 of the 3,389 awards. Next came curriculum with 848, administrative improvement with 599, and student development with 450. In terms of most successful programs, however, faculty development did not do quite as well as expected, with 44% of the programs and only 33% of the nominations as most successful. The other three categories split about even, with each one picking up about 3% more votes for "most successful program" than their percentage of total programs would suggest.

As far as "least successful" nominations are concerned, the concentration was in three areas--curriculum, faculty, and administration. Administrative improvement programs fared worse than expected.

Looking at the breakdown by specific program, certain areas stand out. Curriculum development programs did well, with 25% of the programs and 30% of the "most successful" nominations. Both basic and remedial curricula did well, getting about 3% more successful nominations than their percentage of total grants would have suggested. In faculty development, the NTF program, with almost 19% of the grants awarded, acquired only 12.6% of the "most successful" votes. All of the faculty development programs were slightly less successful than their percentage of the total programs would suggest.

Administrative improvement programs were more successful than predicted in the areas of in-service training and use of outside consultants. Establishment of new offices was not quite as high as one would expect. In student services, both counselling and guidance and remedial and tutorial did slightly better than their percentage of total grants awarded. (The odd situation of having one program in health services nominated three times as most successful is explained by the fact that two institutions had such programs, not funded by Title III, and put them in by mistake.)

The reader may wish to refer back to these tables as he reads further. We thought it best to assemble them in one place in the text for easier reference.

TABLE 23

TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS AWARDED, ALL YEARS

	Direct-Grant	*Participating*	*Coordinators of Consortia*	*Total*
Curriculum Development				
Basic Curriculum	233	187	75	495
Remedial Curriculum	34	26	5	65
Occupational/Career Curriculum	49	21	12	82
Other	87	94	25	206
	403	328	117	848
Faculty Development				
National Teaching Fellows	345	229	66	640
Professors Emeriti	30	11	1	42
In-service Training	102	130	37	269
Advanced Graduate Training	180	126	45	351
Other	103	75	21	199
	760	571	170	1501
Administrative Improvement				
In-service Training	51	56	17	124
Advanced Graduate Training	15	15	8	38
Use of Outside Consultants	70	60	17	147
Establishment of New Offices	68	86	21	175
Other	56	43	16	115
	260	260	79	599

TABLE 23

TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS AWARDED, ALL YEARS

(continued)

Student Services				
Counseling and Guidance	93	77	23	193
Remedial and Tutorial	31	10	2	43
Health Services	0	1	0	1
Other	123	68	22	213
	247	156	47	450

TOTAL, ALL PROGRAMS = 3398

25.0% of all grants in	Curriculum Development
44.2% "	" Faculty Development
17.6% "	" Administrative Improvement
13.2% "	" Student Services

Table 24

ALL TITLE III PROGRAMS: MONEYS AWARDED FOR:

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	Total
Curriculum							
Less than $20,000	0	19	69	70	74	89	321
$20,000-49,999	1	6	32	37	53	27	156
$50,000 or more	2	7	35	47	45	52	188
							665
Faculty Development							
Less than $20,000	2	33	40	43	60	81	259
$20,000-49,999	1	23	96	73	97	82	372
$50,000 or more	0	10	52	50	35	36	183
							814
Administrative Improvement							
Less than $20,000	2	17	59	60	64	66	268
$20,000-49,999	0	0	17	27	30	40	114
$50,000 or more	0	3	3	11	12	18	47
							429
Student Services							
Less than $20,000	1	10	36	48	63	76	234
$20,000-49,999	0	2	5	15	20	26	68
$50,000 or more	0	0	4	11	12	14	41
							343
Total Awards							
Less than $20,000	5	79	204	221	261	312	1082
$20,000-49,999	2	31	150	152	200	175	710
$50,000 or more	2	20	94	119	104	120	459
Total Awards per year	9	130	448	492	565	607	2251

Table 25

TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS - FUNDS MOST HELPFUL

	Funds Most Helpful	*Fairly Helpful*	*Not Helpful*	*No Program in this Area*
I. Curriculum Development				
A. Basic Curriculum	184	38	4	69
B. Remedial Curriculum	56	20	5	177
C. Vocational Curriculum	33	23	4	183
D. Other CUrriculum	78	22	2	125
	351	103	15	554
II. Faculty Development				
A. National Teaching Fellows	158	24	4	53
B. Professors Emeriti	27	12	3	211
C. In-service Training	120	24	3	103
D. Advanced Graduate Training	153	27	2	100
E. Other Faculty Development	59	18	3	153
	517	105	15	620
III. Administrative Improvement				
A. In-service Training	70	42	3	147
B. Advanced Graduate Training	31	22	1	185
C. Outside Consultants	113	48	11	101
D. New Offices Established	92	13	2	147
E. Other Administration	39	17	0	160
	345	142	17	740
IV. Student Services				
A. Counseling and Guidance	95	30	0	130
B. Remedial and/or Tutorial	43	20	1	172
C. Health Services	4	3	3	209
D. Other Student Services	53	10	4	84
	195	63	8	595

TABLE 26

MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS

	Total Grants Awarded	*Most Successful Programs*	*Least Successful Programs*
Curriculum	848 (25.0%)	271 (29.9%)	86 (30.9%)
Faculty Development	1501 (44.2%)	299 (32.9%)	87 (31.3%)
Administrative Improvement	599 (17.6%)	192 (21.1%)	70 (25.2%)
Student Development	450 (13.2%)	146 (16.1%)	35 (12.6%)
TOTAL	3398 (100%)	908 (100%)	278 (100%)

	Total Grants Awarded	*Most Successful Programs, % of 3398*	*Least Successful Programs, % of 3398*
Curriculum	848 (25.0%)	271 (8.0%)	86 (2.5%)
Faculty Development	1501 (44.2%)	299 (8.8%)	87 (2.6%)
Administrative Improvement	599 (17.6%)	192 (5.7%)	70 (2.1%)
Student Development	450 (13.2%)	146 (4.3%)	35 (1.1%)
TOTAL	3398 (100%)	908 (26.8%)	278 (8.3%)

TABLE 27

MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY SPECIFIC PROGRAM

	Total Grants Awarded, % of 3398	*Most Successful Programs, % of 3398*	*Least Successful Programs, % of 3398*
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT			
Basic Curriculum	495 (14.6%)	156 (4.6%)	49 (1.4%)
Remedial Curriculum	65 (1.9%)	49 (1.4%)	12 (0.4%)
Occupational Curriculum	82 (2.4%)	31 (0.9%)	18 (0.5%)
Other	206 (6.1%)	35 (1.0%)	7 (0.2%)
Total	848 (25.0%)	271 (7.9%)	86 (2.5%)
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT			
National Teaching Fellows	640 (18.8%)	114 (3.4%)	9 (0.3%)
Professors Emeriti	42 (1.2%)	9 (0.3%)	7 (0.2%)
In-service Training	269 (7.9%)	56 (1.6%)	34 (1.0%)
Advanced Graduate Training	351 (10.3%)	90 (2.6%)	8 (0.3%)
Other	199 (5.9%)	30 (0.9%)	29 (0.9%)
Total	1501 (44.1%)	299 (8.8%)	87 (2.7%)
ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT			
In-service Training	124 (3.6%)	48 (1.4%)	19 (0.6%)
Advanced Graduate Training	38 (1.1%)	13 (0.4%)	4 (0.1%)
Use of Outside Consultants	147 (4.3%)	67 (2.0%)	25 (0.7%)
Establishment of New Offices	175 (5.2%)	42 (1.2%)	6 (0.2%)
Other	115 (3.4%)	22 (0.6%)	16 (0.5%)
Total	599 (17.6%)	192 (5.6%)	70 (2.1%)
STUDENT SERVICES			
Counselling and Guidance	193 (5.7%)	73 (2.1%)	14 (0.4%)
Remedial and Tutorial	43 (1.3%)	27 (0.8%)	9 (0.3%)
Health Services	1 (0.03%)	3 (0.08%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	213 (6.3%)	43 (1.3%)	12 (0.4%)
Total	450 (13.3%)	146 (4.3%)	35 (1.1%)

TABLE 28

MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY SPECIFIC PROGRAM

	Total Grants Awarded, % of 3398	*Most Successful Programs, % of 908*	*Least Successful Programs, % of 278*
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT			
Basic Curriculum	495 (14.6%)	156 (17.2%)	49 (17.6%)
Remedial Curriculum	65 (1.9%)	49 (5.4%)	12 (4.3%)
Occupational Curriculum	82 (2.4%)	31 (3.4%)	18 (6.[illegible]%)
Other	206 (6.1%)	35 (3.9%)	7 (2.5%)
Total	848 (25.0%)	271 (29.9%)	86 (30.9%)
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT			
National Teaching Fellows	640 (18.8%)	114 (12.6%)	9 (3.2%)
Professors Emeriti	42 (1.2%)	9 (1.0%)	7 (2.5%)
In-service Training	269 (7.9%)	56 (6.2%)	34 (12.2%)
Advanced Graduate Training	351 (10.3%)	90 (9.9%)	8 (2.9%)
Other	199 (5.9%)	30 (3.3%)	29 (10.4%)
Total	1501 (44.1%)	299 (33.0%)	87 (31.2%)
ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT			
In-service Training	124 (3.6%)	48 (5.3%)	19 (6.8%)
Advanced Graduate Training	38 (1.1%)	13 (1.4%)	4 (1.4%)
Use of Outside Consultants	147 (4.3%)	67 (7.4%)	25 (9.0%)
Establishment of New Offices	175 (5.2%)	42 (4.6%)	6 (2.2%)
Other	115 (3.4%)	22 (2.4%)	16 (5.8%)
Total	599 (17.6%)	192 (21.1%)	70 (25.2%)
STUDENT SERVICES			
Counselling and Guidance	193 (5.7%)	73 (8.0%)	14 (5.0%)
Remedial and Tutorial	43 (1.3%)	27 (3.0%)	9 (3.2%)
Health Services	1 (0.[illegible]	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	213 (6.3%)	43 (4.7%)	12 (4.3%)
Total	450 (13.3%)	146 (16.0%)	35 (12.5%)
GRAND TOTAL	3398 (100%)	908 (100%)	278 (100%)

CHAPTER 15

SOME BASIC SUMMARY DATA

As we have shown earlier in this report, there is no such thing as a representative type of "developing institution." We have concluded that there is no such thing as a representative Title III program either.

Funding policies under Title III have varied considerably over time. During fiscal year 1965-66, the first year for which funds were appropriated under Title III, the program as a whole was still in a very experimental stage--only $5 million were then appropriated, and selection criteria had not yet been developed. After the first year, 12 institutions out of 124 supported in year I were not deemed to be "developing," and were dropped from the program during the second year.

Since 1966-67 annual appropriations have been much larger, and individual grants to consortia and individual colleges have increased considerably. Nevertheless, there always were (and still are) vast differences in the size of individual grants, ranging from about $2000 annually (for institutions only marginally affiliated with a Title III consortium) to over $100,000 annually (to a few direct-grant institutions.) This tremendous diversity in grant size provides a serious obstacle to the assessment of cost-effectiveness of these programs. We recognize that in several of our case studies, small grants did sometimes produce spectacular results in some small program areas. We also realize that the benefits derived from using Title III funds are probably cumulative, since recipients of Title III funds are connected with the program for an average of three years.

The character of evaluation itself also causes some problems. A proper and unbiased extended evaluation of even a small number of Title III-funded programs would have been outside the scope of this study. (Even the case studies cannot provide a "perfect" in-depth examination of Title III-funded programs since the interviewers were forced to inventory their findings at one point in time rather than over an extended and therefore more reliable period of time.) The findings and inferences in this part of the report are primarily based on institutional self-description and self-assessment which can be either inaccurately reported or self-serving, or both.

Despite these difficulties, we have tried to interpret financial data, narratives, and institutional self-evaluations as objectively as possible. We will, however, point out when we have cause to believe that institutional self-assessments, even apparently "hard" data, are inaccurate.

In relation to the awards made from fiscal 1966 to 1970, one is struck by differences in consistency of funding patterns by region. Although three years of involvement was average for the country, we found that in the Southeast, the average was almost four, while in the Northeast and Midwest and Far West, the average dropped close to two years. Certainly continuity of funding is vitally important in areas like curriculum and faculty development, and thus we may not be able to reflect any overall view regarding impact of Title III funding in that there was variation by geography in continuity of funding. (However, this would lead us to expect that institutions in the Southeast, having had more continuous funding, should produce greater results just to stay even.)

We have pointed out earlier that it is almost impossible to make valid causal statements about the impact of Title III funds in situations in which programs are not financed wholly by Title III. This turned out to be a bigger problem than we anticipated, as the following chart shows. In virtually every program for every year, Title III funds provided half or more of the total dollars for that program only about 50 percent of the time.

TABLE 29

"DID TITLE III FUNDS PROVIDE 50% OR MORE OF THE MONEY USED IN THIS PROGRAM?"

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

	1965	*66-67*	*67-68*	*68-69*	*69-70*	*70-71*	*Total*
Basic Curriculum Development							
Yes	2	3	20	33	30	36	124
No	1	6	28	34	43	40	152
Faculty Development Funds							
Yes	1	1	24	34	39	46	145
No	1	13	23	36	47	50	170
Administrative Improvement							
Yes	0	2	10	23	24	31	90
No	0	1	18	27	28	32	106
Student Services Improvement							
Yes	0	1	4	9	17	19	50
No	0	0	4	17	21	29	71

Total Yes = 409 Total No = 499

DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

	1965	*66-67*	*67-68*	*68-69*	*69-70*	*70-71*	*Total*
Basic Curriculum Development							
Yes	1	11	37	30	26	29	134
No	1	10	38	31	34	31	145
Faculty Development Funds							
Yes	1	22	64	43	45	43	218
No	3	22	49	28	26	26	154
Administrative Improvement							
Yes	0	10	23	17	20	17	87
No	3	6	12	13	13	21	68
Student Services Improvement							
Yes	0	2	16	14	20	22	74
No	2	5	11	19	19	25	81

Total Yes = 513 Total No = 448

TABLE 29(continued)

COORDINATORS OF CONSORTIA

	1965	*66-67*	*67-68*	*68-69*	*69-70*	*70-71*	*Total*
			Basic Curriculum Development				
Yes	1	0	5	7	6	7	26
No	0	2	7	13	16	20	58
			Faculty Development Funds				
Yes	0	0	6	8	8	12	34
No	0	4	4	6	10	11	35
			Administrative Improvement				
Yes	0	1	2	5	3	5	16
No	0	1	3	5	7	10	26
			Student Services Improvement				
Yes	0	0	4	6	5	8	23
No	0	0	1	5	5	6	17

Total Yes = 99 Total No = 136

Grand Total Yes = 1021 Grand Total No = 1083

In all, Title III was mentioned as providing 50 percent or more of the program in 1021 cases (remember that programs are counted cumulatively), while it was not at the 50 percent level in 1083 cases. This means that in half of the cases no judgments are possible as to the effectiveness of Title III dollars, as they cannot be partialled out and looked at separately from other support dollars. We will simply have to look at relative success criteria for these programs, and assume multiple funding.

The table is also of rough utility in showing how the funding of programs in Title III was done by type of funding. Note that there are few differences in the proportions of programs provided by participating and direct grant funding. This is also true for consortia.

As Table 24 indicates, there were more faculty development grants (814) than any other, with curriculum (665) a fairly close second. Then there is a sharp drop to administrative improvement programs (429) followed by student services (343). Note that the largest number of grants awarded was in the less than $20,000 category. The only category in which this was not the case was in faculty development programs. The funding strategy seemed particularly clear in student services programs, where an overwhelming number of the grants made were in the less than $20,000 category. It is somewhat unclear why the Title III staff felt that programs could be mounted in the student development and services area for so little money. It is clear that a large amount of the resources was placed in faculty and curriculum development, perhaps assuming that if these areas were strong, administrative and student service improvements could be added later.

We are not at all sure that the programs in student services were very successful. (See Table 27, which provides data on program success.) Indeed, the case studies provide rather telling evidence to suggest that programs in this area were not working very well. The programs in administrative improvement also were rated by the institutions as somewhat less helpful than funding in other areas. This was particularly true in terms of the use of outside consultants (Table 27).

Discussions of the reasons given for the relative success of lack thereof will be presented as we analyze each type of funding in turn. It is clear that we are limited here by the institution's natural desire to indicate that the programs were working in order that they might obtain more Title III funds in the future.

SUMMARY TABLES FOR CONSORTIA

Table 30

CONSORTIUM: MONEYS AWARDED FOR:

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	Total
Curriculum							
Less than $20,000	0	0	5	7	7	9	28
$20,000-49,999	0	0	2	6	7	7	22
$50,000 or more	1	2	5	9	12	13	42
							92
Faculty Development							
Less than $20,000	0	2	4	3	2	8	19
$20,000-49,999	0	2	7	6	11	12	38
$50,000 or more	0	1	3	9	9	5	27
							84
Administrative Improvement							
Less than $20,000	0	1	4	3	6	11	25
$20,000-49,999	0	0	1	5	4	3	13
$50,000 or more	0	1	1	4	3	3	12
							50
Student Services							
Less than $20,000	0	0	4	7	8	5	24
$20,000-49,999	0	0	0	2	3	6	11
$50,000 or more	0	0	1	1	0	3	5
							40
Total Awards							
Less than $20,000	0	3	17	20	23	33	96
$20,000-49,999	0	2	10	19	25	28	84
$50,000 or more	1	4	10	23	24	24	86
Total Awards per year	1	9	37	62	72	85	266

TABLE 31

JUDGEMENT OF PROGRAM SUCCESS

COORDINATORS OF CONSORTIA

	Most Successful Programs	*Least Successful Programs*
Curriculum		
Basic Curriculum	24	7
Remedial Curriculum	5	0
Occupational/Career Curriculum	4	5
Other	5	2
	38	14
Faculty Development		
National Teaching Fellows	10	0
Professors Emeriti	0	1
In-service Training	10	8
Advanced Graduate Training	12	1
Other	6	2
	38	12
Administrative Improvement		
In-service Training	4	3
Advanced Graduate Training	4	0
Use of Consultants	4	2
Offices with New Functions	5	0
Other	3	0
	20	5
Student Services		
Counseling and Guidance	3	1
Tutorial and Remedial	4	0
Health Services	1	0
Other	4	0
	12	1
	108	32

Table 32

CONSORTIUM - SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

	Funds Most Helpful	*Fairly Helpful*	*Not Helpful*	*No Program in this Area*
I. Curriculum Development				
A. Basic Curriculum	23	4	1	8
B. Remedial Curriculum	6	0	4	20
C. Vocational Curriculum	2	3	0	22
D. Other CUrriculum	17	2	0	13
	48	9	5	63
II. Faculty Development				
A. National Teaching Fellows	26	2	0	6
B. Professors Emeriti	3	1	0	23
C. In-service Training	13	6	0	13
D. Advanced Graduate Training	22	3	0	9
E. Other Faculty Development	8	2	0	15
	72	14	0	66
III. Administrative Improvement				
A. In-service Training	5	7	0	17
B. Advanced Graduate Training	4	2	0	21
C. Outside Consultants	12	3	1	13
D. New Offices Established	14	1	0	15
E. Other Administration	8	2	0	16
	43	15	1	82
IV. Student Services				
A. Counseling and Guidance	6	4	0	17
B. Remedial and/or Tutorial	5	2	0	21
C. Health Services	1	0	0	24
D. Other Student Services	7	1	0	9
	19	7	0	71

CHAPTER 16

USE AND IMPACT OF TITLE III FUNDS ON CONSORTIA

Consortia have played an important role in planning programs which would have been beyond the scope of individual institutions. Consortia have also been instrumental in channelling Title III funds to institutions which would not have been eligible for direct assistance, either because they were too undeveloped (a rare case) or because they were already too developed (a not-so-rare case).

A. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

The number of our questionnaire respondents representing consortia receiving Title III funds for curriculum development was extremely small until 1967-68. (See Table 30.) In that year, a total of 12 consortia obtained funds for that purpose--five consortia received less than $20,000; two received between $20,000 and $49,999; and five received $50,000 or more. Most of the consortia stated that less than half of the total funds for curriculum development purposes (26 of 58 programs mentioned) in which Title III funds were used were Title III monies. As with other program areas, Title III was seldom the sole support for these programs, as we have seen demonstrated in Table 29.

In 1968-69, the number of consortia receiving Title III funds for curriculum development rose to 22; 6 had below $20,000, 7 had $20,000-$49,999, and 8 consortia received $50,000 or more. Again, most of the consortia stated that less than half of the funds for curriculum development programs in which Title III funds were used were actually Title III monies.

In 1969-70, 12 out of 26 consortia reporting grants for curriculum development purposes received $50,000 or more, and again the majority stated that Title III did not constitute the major funding source for those programs.

The following year again showed an increase in the number of consortia whose curriculum development projects were funded. The number rose to 29, out of which 13 received $50,000 or more. Most of these programs were in the area of basic curriculum development. Again, most of these consortia had large amounts of non-Title III funds for these projects.

The area of basic curriculum and it, development was regarded as one of the most urgent tasks by many consortia receiving Title III funding for curriculum development. Adding new academic subjects (15 mentions) and research on curricular revision (12 mentions) were cited as the programs most often funded. Twenty-seven programs ran for one year or less, 15 for 2 years, 9 for 3 years. Almost no consortia developed a behavioral objectives approach to basic curriculum, and none worked in computer-assisted instruction.

Among consortia emphasizing the area of remedial programs, the development of basic skills programs was most frequent (7 mentions). Four consortia also instituted developmental reading programs. Seven of the consortia stressing remedial programs received Title III funds for this purpose for one year, 8 for two years. Consortia reported no pre-vocational orientation programs, only one tutorial program, and no courses in remedial communications skills. These areas were slighted for reasons we do not understand.

Just about all consortia having received funds for curriculum development reported that the programs had been successful; the area of basic curriculum was mentioned most often (24 mentions) as the area that had been most successful (partly because most consortia concentrated on that area), while remedial curriculum programs were judged as successful only five times. (See Table 31).

There are many problems for consortium coordinators here, in that certain programs may have been very successful on some campuses in their group and not on others. Our case studies do point out several institutions in which curricular development did take place successfully through a consortium. Because many of the developing institutions were weak in the "standard" academic curriculum areas, it is clear that this is what most of the programs provided. Institutions that were unable to round out their basic curriculum, in the liberal arts particularly, were able to do so through the consortium. (It should be remembered that in most cases Title III funds were not the dominant factor in these programs as far as funding is concerned).

We also asked respondents to indicate which of these programs were least successful. (See Table 31). Seven nominated the basic curriculum area as being least successful, while the occupational/career curriculum was mentioned as being least successful by five respondents. Considering that there were only seven programs in operation in this category, it would appear that the consortium coordinators were having real difficulty in occupational/career programs. Given the kinds of students developing institutions attract, this seems an area in which considerable work needs to be done in order to improve program quality.

B. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

Twenty-seven consortia reported having helped member institutions obtain National Teaching Fellows; 23 schools receiving NTF's tended to ask for NTF's from several disciplines (rather than concentrating several NTF's in one department). The reason for employing NTF's most often mentioned (15 consortia) was "to free regular staff members for advanced study." The next most important reason given (11 responses) was "to help improve the existing curriculum and/or the quality of teaching."

The Professors Emeriti program seems to have been virtually ignored by consortia; only four consortia reported having helped member institutions find PE's.

In-Service Training for Regular Faculty Members was a very important part of the faculty development program in over 20 consortia. Most of this in-service training took place in the form of workshops organized by consortia for faculty from member institutions. Most of these workshops were organized on the campus of a member institution of the consortium, and the majority of these workshops attracted between 10 and 14 participants. Conferences with consultants on matters of faculty development were arranged by half a dozen consortia.

About 25 helped their member institutions arrange for advanced graduate training for their faculty; most of the faculty who were selected for advanced training reported by 14 consortia, were social scientists. In 16 cases, fewer than five faculty members per consortium were involved. Leaves of absence for advanced graduate training were granted primarily to faculty planning to earn a doctorate. 11 consortia reported the PHD as the primary degree earned, while 9 indicated a combination of MA and PHD work. Some faculty left their institution after they had obtained their higher degree through Title III--eight consortia reported that their member institutions lost in this way. In seven consortia, the number of faculty who left was one to two, in one consortium three to five.

One can, of course, raise questions here regarding the true mission of Title III - if a young, bright faculty member goes off to a distinguished institution, finishes a doctorate through an NTF, and leaves the host campus to teach at a prestigious university, can it truly be said that the program has failed? Must all black medical students "return to the ghetto" to set up medical practice? These are difficult issues to raise. But clearly, most consortia in our study did not lose faculty through the NTF program.

The Professors Emeriti program was used by only two consortia, and one of the two nominated their PE program as least successful in the faculty development area.

Faculty in-service training was handled differently by different consortia:

Workshops for faculty from various colleges	10
Conferences with consultants	5
Visits to other campuses	5
Attendance at regional-national meetings	5
Workshops organized by consortium for their members	10
Other programs	12

These programs began to increase in number by 1970.

DATES OF WORKSHOPS

1966 - 1, 1967 - 4, 1968 - 7, 1969 - 7, 1970 - 11, 1971 - 16

Most consortia (15) reported that 20 or more faculty members were involved in these in-service programs.

One interesting finding that emerges from the case studies is the great effectiveness of some programs which allow faculty to visit other institutions. Not only do they get off familiar ground for a time, they also make new contacts, see some programs in actual operation, and often develop a better sense of what is possible on their own campus. Some of these virtues are also present in the workshop format with faculty from several institutions present. But we would recommend more sustained use of the pattern of faculty visits to other campuses.

When the consortia were asked (Table 31) which ones of the faculty development programs they regarded as the most successful, the programs mentioned were National Teaching Fellows, (10 mentions) in-service training for faculty, (10 mentions) and advanced graduate training for faculty (12 mentions). The reasons given for the success of these programs dealt primarily with the general improvement of teaching and the improvement of faculty quality (17 mentions). A small number of consortia (eight) reported that the in-service training for faculty had not been quite as successful as anticipated, due primarily to a lack of faculty interest and involvement.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT

In-service training for administrators, was established by 15 consortia, six programs reported sending administrators of member institutions to attend regional or national conferences; 5 involved locally organized workshops and institutes.

Six consortia helped member institutions find appropriate advanced graduate training opportunities for administrators, usually at institutions in the same area. Only one or two administrators in a consortium generally used this opportunity. Interestingly enough, none of them studied matters related to administration, such as business administration, data processing, systems analysis, etc. From the case studies, we found several instances of an administrator working on a PHD program in a subject field.

About 8 consortia in our study hired *consultants* to help member institutions carry out specific improvements. The majority of consultants (5) helped on administrative reorganization and in five cases, the consultants were free agents rather than employees of management or educational consulting firms.

Ten consortia helped member institutions set up *new offices*, 7 reported development offices and 6 reported institutional research offices. These offices were set up mainly in 1968 and 1969. Our data from the questionnaire unfortunately does not reveal how long these offices continued after their establishment. Interview data revealed that in some cases, institutions were unable to maintain these new offices after the consultants left. However, this was a general problem not limited to offices established through consortia. This issue will be raised in the final section in discussing the role of consultants, and is also present in our case study of TACTICS.

When the consortium coordinators were asked to rate the administrative improvement programs according to their relative success, no single approach to administrative improvement was rated above others. (See Table 31). Although direct grant and participating institutions reported much dissatisfaction with this area, only five consortia reported that any of the administrative improvement programs had been less successful than expected. This clearly was not an area in which coordinators of consortia were very actively involved.

D. IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT SERVICES

In the area of counseling and guidance, the emphasis of consortia providing assistance to member institutions was primarily on helping these schools establish new counseling offices (5 consortia) or helping them improve their existing counseling programs (3 consortia).

About half a dozen consortia assisted member institutions in setting up tutorial and remedial programs, primarily for freshmen who needed help in perfecting basic skills in general or remedial English skills in particular. We were somewhat surprised at this low figure.

Although Title III would have provided funds for the improvement of health services, not one consortium among our respondents reported having applied for funds in this area. Again, it is not clear why.

The counseling and guidance programs and tutorial and remedial programs were deemed successful by nearly every consortium respondent (Table 31).

E. CONSORTIA'S OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE USEFULNESS OF TITLE III FUNDS

Twenty-three consortia reported that funds used for the improvement of the basic curriculum had been particularly helpful in the area of curriculum development. (See Table 32). There were two main advantages that Title III funding made possible. The first was the addition of new academic subjects, and the second was the possibility for genuine research on curricular revision. Fifteen consortia indicated the importance of the new academic subjects that were added, while 12 reported the importance of research on curricular revision. Interestingly enough, no consortium indicated that additional vocational subjects were of importance, and no consortium had developed behavioral objective approaches nor computer-assisted learning in relation to their curriculum development programs. Ten of the programs had been in operation for two years, and seven for three years. These programs seem to have some advantage over the thirteen programs that had only had one year of funding in curriculum development.

Under remedial programs in curriculum, the development of basic skills programs was the most frequent with seven consortia reporting them, while four reported developmental reading programs had been established through Title III. There was no concern for tutorial programs or pre-vocation orientation programs. Some comments from consortia that had developed basic skills programs indicated that this is something that they very much wanted to do earlier but could not fund out of their own resources. Again, we have no data on the quality of these programs in terms of the number of students who were "salvaged" by them and made into better students as a consequence.

The occupational and vocational area of curriculum development money for consortia was conspicuous by its small number of efforts. Two programs in career orientation, two in cooperative education, and two in trade fields comprised the largest number of programs, and most of these were one year in duration. Given the small number of programs in this area, there were no comments that seemed to have much weight.

In terms of the least successful programs that were mentioned, (Table 31) seven consortia indicated that the basic curriculum was the program that was the least successful area, and five indicated that the occupational career curriculum programs were the most unsuccessful. Given the small numbers in these two areas, they seem to be distinctly unsuccessful, at least in a numerical sense. (It should be explained here that "least successful" is not the same as the category "not helpful" listed in the summary tabulation at the beginning of this chapter. "Least successful" is more of an index of genuine program failure, where as the "not helpful" category simply means that the program was not changed much one way or another by the addition of Title III monies.)

In the area of faculty development, the National Teaching Fellows program was the most wide-spread, with 26 consortia reporting that the program was the most helpful in the area of faculty development. (See Table 32.) The reasons for this were both that the program freed regular staff member for advanced study (11 consortia) and that they helped to improve the existing curriculum and the quality of teaching (5 consortia). In our most successful category, (Table 31) ten consortia indicated that the NTF program was the most successful in the area of faculty development, and no consortium listed it as being among the least successful programs. The Professors Emeriti program, as indicated before, was conspicuous by its absence. Apparently, Title III consortia wanted younger men and women with newer ideas. In-service training programs were listed as being most helpful by 13 consortia, (Table 32) and as most successful by 10 (Table 31.) Some of the in-service training programs were also listed as being least successful, generally because the faculty had no particular interest in in-service or advanced graduate training. Overall, the programs for faculty development seemed to be seen as most helpful by the consortium respondents.

In the administrative area, one gets the feeling generally that there was less enthusiasm for the success of programs of in-service training and advanced graduate training (Table 31.) Outside consultants, however, were useful, particularly in terms of helping to establish new offices on campus. The reasons given generally for these successes were first that the administration was able to develop greater specialized expertise, and secondly that an increase could be noticed in administrative efficiency as a consequence of the consultants and the new offices. However, only five consortia responded in this way.

In the student services area, consortia seemed to find the establishment of new counseling offices to be quite useful, with five consortia indicating that tutorial and remedial programs established under Title III were most helpful (Table 32.) The most important reason for these programs success, as given by the consortia, was that they were well received by the students and seemed to have the students' support. There were almost no cases of a consortium indicating that the student services programs were either least effective or not helpful. However, one is stuck with the lack of specificity regarding the institutions' reason for saying that these programs were successful. It may be that simply the establishment of an office or a person to deal with this very pressing problem was a considerable morale-builder to the institution, even if no positive gains on the part of student performance could be registered. This is speculation on our part, as the questionnaire data does not reveal any answer.

Overall, one is impressed with the fact that consortium coordinators did not seem to develop programs that were significantly different from institutional-based programs, nor did their evaluations of these programs differ much from those of their campus-based colleges. Even given the difficulties in self-rating instruments such as our own, there seemed to be few differences between consortia strategies and those of participating and direct-grant institutions.

SUMMARY TABLES FOR PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Table 33

PARTICIPATING: MONEYS AWARDED FOR:

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	Total
Curriculum							
Less than $20,000	0	2	21	38	43	54	158
$20,000-49,999	1	3	10	9	17	6	46
$50,000 or more	1	3	18	21	18	16	77
							281
Faculty Development							
Less than $20,000	1	11	11	29	45	61	158
$20,000-49,999	0	1	28	27	36	29	121
$50,000 or more	0	2	9	15	11	13	50
							329
Administrative Improvement							
Less than $20,000	0	2	23	32	30	35	122
$20,000-49,999	0	0	7	11	16	21	55
$50,000 or more	0	1	0	6	7	7	21
							198
Student Services							
Less than $20,000	0	1	7	15	27	41	91
$20,000-49,999	0	0	1	8	8	6	23
$50,000 or more	0	0	0	3	6	4	13
							127
Total Awards							
Less than $20,000	1	16	62	114	145	191	529
$20,000-49,999	1	4	46	55	77	62	245
$50,000 or more	1	6	27	45	42	40	161
Total Awards per year	3	26	135	214	264	293	935

Table 34

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS - SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

	Funds Most Helpful	*Fairly Helpful*	*Not Helpful*	*No Program in this Area*
I. Curriculum Development				
A. Basic Curriculum	76	19	2	36
B. Remedial Curriculum	21	11	1	82
C. Vocational Curriculum	11	14	3	86
D. Other CUrriculum	35	13	2	54
	143	57	8	258
II. Faculty Development				
A. National Teaching Fellows	92	8	1	35
B. Professors Emeriti	9	4	1	106
C. In-service Training	58	21	3	46
D. Advanced Graduate Training	62	14	0	52
E. Other Faculty Development	25	9	2	72
	246	56	7	311
III. Administrative Improvement				
A. In-service Training	40	25	3	64
B. Advanced Graduate Training	14	11	1	90
C. Outside Consultants	57	28	7	44
D. New Offices Established	41	5	2	77
E. Other Administration	15	8	0	80
	167	77	13	355
IV. Student Services				
A. Counseling and Guidance	45	15	0	59
B. Remedial and/or Tutorial	14	9	1	86
C. Health Services	2	2	2	97
D. Other Student Services	20	4	3	40
	81	30	6	282

TABLE 35

JUDGEMENT OF PROGRAM SUCCESS

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

	Most Successful Programs	*Least Successful Programs*
Curriculum		
Basic Curriculum	63	19
Remedial Curriculum	23	8
Occupational/Career Curriculum	9	8
Other	24	3
	119	38
Faculty Development		
National Teaching Fellows	48	3
Professors Emeriti	4	4
In-service Training	32	14
Advanced Graduate Training	33	3
Other	9	16
	126	40
Administrative Improvement		
In-service Training	24	13
Advanced Graduate Training	4	3
Use of Consultants	32	13
Offices with New Functions	21	3
Other	10	14
	91	46
Student Services		
Counseling and Guidance	33	6
Tutorial and Remedial	10	3
Health Services	2	0
Other	19	4
	64	13
	400	137

CHAPTER 17

CONSEQUENCES OF TITLE III FUNDS ON PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Participating institutions are member institutions of Title III consortia. Many of them have participated in such consortia for long periods of time (in many cases even before Title III began) and have received substantial sums of money. The length of membership in a consortium is usually not specified _a priori_, except for members of two-year college consortia organized through the Program With Developing Institutions (PWDI) of the American Association of Junior Colleges. The now defunct PWDI made it clear to the members of its consortia that the consortia were formed on an _ad hoc_ basis and that an institution's membership in a consortium was not to exceed two or three years because of the sequential approach to solving an institution's problems (see our case study on AAJC).

Participating institutions not only differ in the time period for which they belonged to a consortium, but even more in their degree of involvement with the consortium. An institution located further away from the area in which most consortium members are clustered tends to be only marginally involved; the same is true for institutions which add differing subjects to their existing curriculum. Among the more interesting additions to the basic curriculum in participating institutions were the addition of freshmen engineering courses taught over a tele-writer from the campus of a nearby large state university, professional business courses offering work experience in business and industry for part of each semester, and a pre-professional program in social work offering field work in the local community. Comments here are quite similar to those of the consortium coordinators, with 26 institutions indicating that new academic subjects were added through Title III curriculum funds, while 30 indicated that research on curricula was made possible in this way. Seventeen developed cultural enrichment programs. Ninety-three of these programs were for one year only.

In the remedial curricular area for participating institutions, the split was approximately even between basic skills programs (18 institutions) and development reading programs (14 institutions). The occupational and career programs were primarily in career orientation efforts (9 institutions). And again, most of the programs were of one year's duration.

Looking at the most successful programs for curricular development, in participating institutions, 63 indicated that the basic curriculum programs were most successful, 23 indicated remedial curriculum programs, and 9 indicated the occupational and career curricula (Table 35). The reasons given are basically the same reasons given by the consortium coordinators, with the exception that in this area a few more of the remedial curriculum programs seemed to be positive in the sense of improving students' self-image and enabling them to work more effectively.

On the least-successful-program side in curriculum, 19 indicated that basic curriculum programs were least successful, 8 indicated remedial programs, and 8 indicated occupational career programs. The most frequent comments here were that the students were lacking in motivation and that the institutions had great difficulty in finding keys to get to the students and make these programs work more effectively. However, some work was being done of extreme interest. One college, for example, used its funds to establish a finger-spelling course for students with hearing handicaps. Some institutions used these funds to set up or improve adult basic education courses for minority populations, with the intent of offering GED programs. Eighteen of these programs lasted one year, while 14 lasted two years. In addition to the 63 institutions that indicated that basic curriculum programs were the most successful, 19 reported that these programs were the least successful in the area (Table 35.)

A. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Only 14 responding institutions received Title III funds for faculty development in 1966-67, and 11 of these received less than $20,000 (Table 33.) By 1970-71 the number of these had risen to 103. Of these, the National Teaching Fellow program was the one indicated as being the most helpful (Table 34.) Thirty-four institutions indicated that it was the improvement of existing curriculum and quality of teaching that mattered the most, while 44 felt that it was the freeing of regular staff members for advanced study that was the most helpful aspect of the program.

In addition to these assessments as to the helpfulness of Title III monies, the most successful programs (Table 35) indicated that the National Teaching Fellows were most successful at 48 institutions, with advanced graduate training being most successful at 33. The NTF program was seen as the least successful program in faculty development by only 3.

On the other hand, 14 indicated that the in-service training programs were the least successful, due particularly to lack of faculty motivation and involvement. It would appear that the National Teaching Fellows program was not only extremely successful numerically but also that relatively few of such programs were significant failures. A few institutions were able to start innovative courses thanks to the NTF's, such as courses in adaptive physical education for physically handicapped, Indian history courses, etc.

Once again, the Professors Emeriti program was conspicuous in its absence. The PE's were spread out rather well across the humanities and natural and social sciences, and although six institutions reported PE's specializing in one of these areas, eight institutions indicated that the PE's worked in more than one of these fields. Given, this, the fact that four of the Professors Emeriti programs were listed as being least successful (Table 35) is perhaps some indication of serious problems in this area. The most frequent reason given was the Professors Emeriti simply had no impact on the campus. Whether this was age or lack of motivation, our data does not reveal.

Among in-service training programs for faculty, workshops organized by the consortium for its member institutions were the single most popular programs. Over 100 respondent institutions were involved in these activities. Of these, 45 tended to be located on campuses of consortium member colleges. Ninety-five institutions reported that these programs involved 20 or more faculty. Thus the workshops and in-service training programs tended to be rather large in terms of the number of faculty from each institution represented. However, 14 of the in-service training programs were listed as being least successful, (Table 35) particularly because there was no faculty interest in such in-service work and apparently no administrative leadership capable of making the faculty interested.

Advanced graduate training opportunities were used by faculty in all fields, with 37 institutions reporting faculty working in the humanities, 22 in the natural and pure sciences, and 37 in the social sciences. The vast majority of institutions (120) indicated that fewer than 5 faculty were involved in the advanced graduate training program, compared to only 3 voted least-successful in the area (Table 35.)

Fourteen institutions found the in-service programs to which they sent their faculty unsatisfactory, usually because the faculty did not seem to gain new skills, enthusiasm, or insight as to the nature of their work. We cannot tell from our data whether the size of the work group was a factor, or whether the quality of the workshop's presentations were at fault.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT

Again, it was only in 1967-68 that sizeable numbers of participating institutions began getting administrative improvement funds (30 during that year) (Table 33.) By 1970-71 the number had increased to 63. In-service training programs were widely used in the administrative improvement area. In 23 cases this meant attendance at regional or national conferences and in 33 cases it meant workshops and institutions organized locally or within the confines of the consortium. These programs were indicated as being most successful by 24 institutions, but were indicated as being least successful by 13 institutions (Table 35.)

In addition to in-service training, consultants were used primarily to help on administrative reorganization (35 institutions) and to assist in curriculum development or review (23 institutions). The consultants were overwhelmingly individuals rather than persons working for a management consulting firm.

The offices established were primarily development offices (45 institutions) and institutional research offices (26 institutions).

Twenty campuses encouraged their administrators to take advanced graduate training. In most cases these administrators were able to enroll at a large local institution. Most of the institutions (10) sent only one of their administrators for this type of training; 9 institutions sent between 2 and 4. In almost all cases, the person went to a college or university in the same area.

The use of consultants was seen as the most successful program (Table 35) in this area with 32 institutions, while the setting up of new offices with new functions was seen by 21 as most successful, with the in-service training program being seen by 24 institutions as the most successful program. However, as we have said, some were disappointed, particularly in the use of consultants. Some data indicates that the consultants were not on campus long enough to really get a feel for the local problems. This comes through particularly from one of the case studies. Perhaps there is some need for a consultant no matter how broadly knowledgeable about higher education, to spend enough time on a campus to become thoroughly familiar with the particular problems of that campus.

C. STUDENT SERVICES

As far as the least successful programs are concerned, (Table 35) counseling and guidance was the largest area, with six institutions reporting this--due almost entirely to a lack of student interest in the program, plus a general feeling that there may not have been enough qualified personnel to do the program justice.

We were surprised that the number of participating institutions using Title III funds for the improvement of student services was so relatively small. We also felt that the remedial and tutorial area was neglected and we were surprised that Title III staff members did not do more to either encourage good proposals in this area or to make sure that the funds got to worthy programs already in existence.

D. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Looking at the assessment of the utility of Title III funds overall, and shifting for a moment from most successful to most helpful funds, (Table 34) we find that 76 schools reported that funds used for basic curriculum improvement were the most helpful in curriculum development, while 92 reported that National Teaching Fellowship money was most useful in the faculty development area. In-service training and advanced graduate training were next with 58 and 62 reports as most helpful respectively. In the area of administrative improvement, 57 ranked outside consultants as most helpful, and 40 indicated that in-service training programs had been of most help. In 41 cases, the establishment of new administrative offices was listed as the most helpful contribution. In the student services area, counseling and guidance programs were far and away the most helpful aspect of the program, with 45 institutions reporting this as the most helpful area. Since the number of participating institutions among our respondents was rather large, the main trends were somewhat clearer than in the case of coordinators of consortia. Curriculum development and faculty development are clearly the areas of greatest concern to those responding for most participating institutions.

The large number of new offices established with Title III funds was quite significant, especially considering that, unlike the addition of a new course or the hiring of a consultant, the future maintenance of such an office requires a firm commitment on the part of the college. (It is unclear from our data how many institutions have actually made that commitment, and we cannot tell from our data how many of the fairly large number of offices established under Title III are still in operation today.)

SUMMARY TABLES FOR DIRECT GRANT INSTITUTIONS

Table 36

DIRECT GRANT: MONEYS AWARDED FOR:

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	Total
Curriculum							
Less than $20,000	0	17	43	25	24	26	135
$20,000-49,999	0	3	20	22	24	14	83
$50,000 or more	0	2	12	17	15	23	69
							287
Faculty Development							
Less than $20,000	1	20	25	11	13	12	82
$20,000-49,999	1	20	61	40	50	41	213
$50,000 or more	0	7	40	26	15	18	106
							401
Administrative Improvement							
Less than $20,000	2	14	32	25	28	20	121
$20,000-49,999	0	1	9	11	10	16	47
$50,000 or more	0	1	2	1	2	8	14
							182
Student Services							
Less than $20,000	1	9	25	26	28	30	119
$20,000-49,999	0	2	4	5	9	14	34
$50,000 or more	0	0	3	7	6	7	23
							176
Total Awards							
Less than $20,000	4	60	125	87	93	88	457
$20,000-49,999	1	26	94	78	93	85	377
$50,000 or more	0	10	57	51	38	56	212
Total Awards per year	5	96	276	216	224	229	1046

Table 37

DIRECT GRANT INSTITUTIONS - SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

	Funds Most Helpful	*Fairly Helpful*	*Not Helpful*	*No Program in this Area*
I. Curriculum Development				
A. Basic Curriculum	85	15	1	25
B. Remedial Curriculum	29	9	0	75
C. Vocational Curriculum	20	6	1	75
D. Other CUrriculum	26	7	0	58
	160	37	2	233
II. Faculty Development				
A. National Teaching Fellows	115	14	3	12
B. Professors Emeriti	15	7	2	82
C. In-service Training	49	26	0	44
D. Advanced Graduate Training	69	10	2	39
E. Other Faculty Development	26	7	1	66
	274	64	8	243
III. Administrative Improvement				
A. In-service Training	25	10	0	66
B. Advanced Graduate Training	13	9	0	74
C. Outside Consultants	44	17	3	44
D. New Offices Established	37	7	0	55
E. Other Administration	16	7	0	64
	135	50	3	303
IV. Student Services				
A. Counseling and Guidance	44	11	0	54
B. Remedial and/or Tutorial	24	11	0	65
C. Health Services	1	1	1	88
D. Other Student Services	26	5	1	35
	95	28	2	242

TABLE 38

JUDGEMENT OF PROGRAM SUCCESS

DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

	Most Successful Programs	*Least Successful Programs*
Curriculum		
Basic Curriculum	69	23
Remedial Curriculum	21	4
Occupational/Career Curriculum	18	5
Other	6	2
	114	34
Faculty Development		
National Teaching Fellows	56	6
Professors Emeriti	5	2
In-service Training	14	12
Advanced Graduate Training	45	4
Other	15	11
	135	35
Administrative Improvement		
In-service Training	20	3
Advanced Graduate Training	5	1
Use of Consultants	31	10
Offices with New Functions	16	3
Other	9	2
	81	19
Student Services		
Counseling and Guidance	37	7
Tutorial and Remedial	13	6
Health Services	0	0
Other	20	8
	70	21
	400	109

CHAPTER 18

USE AND IMPACT OF TITLE III FUNDS ON DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

Direct-grant institutions have a direct contractual relationship (hence their name) with the USOE. Such institutions have won their contracts after submitting a proposal for Title III funding to the USOE in direct competition with other colleges competing for the same resources. Participating institutions can obtain Title III funds through the "back door" of consortium membership and do not have to submit their own proposals. The fact that direct-grant institutions have had the resources to produce an acceptable proposal immediately puts them in a rather special position among Title III recipients. (The heightened entrepreneurial value of this aspect of the direct-grant strategy may be an important motivating factor, at least for institutions that are ready to compete.)

A. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Until 1967-68, the number of direct-grant institutions which had obtained Title III funds for curriculum development was very small (Table 36.)

In that year, their number reached 75. Subsequently the number has declined somewhat, to 60 institutions in 1970-71.

Since 1965-66, 233 direct-grant institutions which have received Title III funds for curriculum development have used these funds for the development of their basic curriculum. One hundred and thirty-five of the 287 grants made during the whole period were less than $20,000.

The single largest group (55) of direct-grant programs used their basic curriculum funds to add new academic subjects. The second largest group (32) spent their basic curriculum funds on research on curricular revision. Third in importance (18) was the establishment of a basic skills program. The vast majority (105) of thse programs were funded for one year only.

Some institutions used basic curriculum funds to change the format rather than the content of their course offerings. For example, one school used the funds to research and plan a new calendar, while another school experimented with accelerated programs. Among the more interesting "traditional" uses (i.e., use of basic curriculum funds to expand the existing curriculum) was the college which had a cooperative arrangement with a theater club in a nearby city to aid drama students in meeting the "theatrical profession's standards of excellence and prepare students to teach drama." A number of Afro-American studies programs were also funded with the help of basic curriculum funds provided by Title III.

In the area of remedial programs, the two largest groups of users were those allocating the funds for the development of basic skills programs (16 institutions) and those allocating them for the establishment of developmental reading programs (21). Again, the majority of these programs (31) were funded for one year only.

Fewer than 25% of all direct-grant institutions used curriculum development funds in the area of occupational programs. The two largest areas are career orientation (7) and co-op programs (7). This has clearly not been an area of great concern to direct-grant institutions.

The single largest group of respondents (69) regarded the basic curriculum programs as the most successful ones. (Table 38.) However, 23 direct-grant institutions also said that they regarded the basic curriculum program as the least successful program funded with Title III curriculum development monies.

B. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

In 1966-67, almost all faculty development funds went for National Teaching Fellows; 42 direct-grant institutions reported having hired NTF's at a cost of either less than $20,000 (24 institutions) or between $20,000 and $49,999 (18 institutions). The number of direct-grant institutions hiring NTF's rose dramatically in 1967-68 when 116 institutions reported having hired them. This number later declined; in 1970-71, only 58 institutions still had NTF programs.

In-service training (24 institutions) and advanced graduate training programs for faculty (35 institutions) were added in 1967-68; in the long run, the latter programs became the second most pervasive programs.

In almost all direct-grant institutions the National Teaching Fellows worked in a variety of fields, rather than being clustered around one department. The two most frequent reasons cited for their usefulness were "they help improve the existing curriculum and the quality of teaching," (48 mentions) and "they free regular staff members for advanced graduate study" (61 mentions). Another argument in their favor frequently mentioned was that they brought in fresh approaches and ideas to teaching (24 mentions).

Only slightly over 20 direct-grant institutions used faculty development funds to hire Professors Emeriti during the entire funding period.

Institutions which made in-service training opportunities possible for their faculty emphasized primarily their use of workshops (35), institutes (20), and consultants (28). Most of the workshops and institutes were attended by 20 or more faculty and were primarily located on campus (which accounts for the high participation rate).

Most respondents reported that social scientists constituted the largest group of faculty members receiving advanced graduate training. Institutions involved in this program usually made advanced graduate study possible for up to four faculty members. One of the possible consequences of advanced training programs involves the loss of good faculty to the institution. In the direct-grant institutions, 33 reported losing no faculty, 27 lost one or two, 12 lost three to five faculty, and one lost between six and ten faculty. In participating institutions, 47 reported losing none, 14 lost one or two, 4 lost three to five, and none lost more than five. The numbers are too small for much useful generalization in comparing these two sets of figures. However, the direct-grant institutions did lose a few more faculty than did participating institutions. We cannot say why.

The National Teaching Fellows program was mentioned by 56 colleges as the most successful program. (Table 38.) The advanced graduate training program was second in popularity with 45. The in-service training program had been less than a success for 12 institutions, due primarily to a lack of faculty interest, while only 14 considered it their most successful program in faculty development. In-service training programs were not too successful, considering both figures.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT

Direct-grant institutions said that they used administrative improvement funds for in-service training (43), use of outside consultants (70), and establishment of new offices (68), during the 1965-66 to 1970-71 funding period. In all cases the amounts involved tended to be less than $20,000. Over time, the use of consultants and establishment of new offices became somewhat more frequent, while fewer institutions used administrative improvement monies for in-service training. Slightly more institutions (22) used in-service training funds for workshops and institutes rather than for management seminars (14) or attendance at regional or national workshops (13). Whatever the nature of programs funded with Title III in-service training funds, they were usually held on the campus of the respondent institution or somewhere nearby.

Twenty-three direct-grant institutions provided advanced graduate training for some administrators. The number of administrators per institution to whom advanced graduate training was made available ranged from one to four, and most of the opportunities for graduate study were available nearby on the campus of a larger institution. Interestingly enough, only three institutions reported any administrators studying data processing or systems analysis, three in accounting, six in general business administration, while 26 were engaged in other study. Although we don't know the exact numbers in "other," some were engaged in curriculum study and others were studying in academic disciplines and law.

Most of the colleges which hired consultants for administrative improvement purposes had them work either in the area of administrative reorganization (27) or in the area of curriculum development and review (31). Only 9 were working to improve student personnel services, and 12 on data processing systems. The "other" category was used by 45 institutions. No pattern emerged from their write-in answers. Fifty-three of these consultants were independent; only a small number of direct-grant institutions contracted for consulting services with either educational (21) or management consulting firms (9).

Among the new offices established, most were either development offices (26) or institutional research offices (20) which were established in 1967-68 or later.

Thirty-one respondents, (Table 38) assessing the success of their administrative improvement programs, said that consultants had been the single most important factor in helping them improve their administration, indicating that they had improved administrative expertise and efficiency. A smaller number of schools mentioned in-service training (20) and the establishment of new offices (16) as most successful. But, as in the case of consortium coordinators and participating institutions, 10 institutions were critical of the performance of consultants. The consultants were mentioned in the case data as being occasionally unwilling to learn about the institution's problems, and in one case the consultant did not know his area. One can conjecture also from the cases about the human relations skills of some of the consultants.

D. STUDENT SERVICES

During the 1965-66 to 1970-71 period, 93 uses of student services funds provided by Title III for counseling and guidance services were reported. In most cases, the institution received less than $20,000. Only 31 mentions were made of using student services funds for remedial and tutorial services, again a surprisingly small number. No institution reported using the money for developing student health services.

Twenty-seven institutions using Title III funds for counseling and guidance services allocated these monies for the improvement of existing counseling programs, while 11 established new counseling offices. Fourteen used money for vocational teaching and career guidance programs. Most of the programs were funded for one year only.

In 10 institutions, tutorial and remedial funds were used to establish remedial basic skills courses for freshmen; in 10 others remedial English courses were developed, while 10 also developed freshman tutoring. Most programs were only funded for a single year.

Thirty-seven of the approximately 65 institutions (Table 38) which had received funds for the improvement of student services reported that counseling and guidance programs were the most successful student services programs funded by Title III, while 13 voted for tutorial and remedial programs. Twenty of these programs indicated that student reaction to them was very good. A small number of colleges said their counseling and guidance services had not been too successful, primarily because there was little student interest in the program.

E. DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS' ASSESSMENT OF THE USEFULNESS OF TITLE III FUNDS

On the whole, direct-grant institutions tended to regard the basic curriculum funds as having been the most helpful (Table 37) funds in the area of curriculum development (85 institutions), while the National Teaching Fellows program was seen as the most helpful faculty development program, being nominated by 115 institutions.

Consultants proved to be most helpful in the area of administrative improvement (44 institutions), while 37 felt that the establishment of new offices was most helpful. (Only 25 nominated in-service training programs as most useful, and 13 mentioned advanced graduate training as the most effective administrative program.) Funds earmarked for counseling and guidance were seen as the most helpful aspect of student services improvement by 44 institutions, while 24 picked remedial and tutorial.

F. THE AGGREGATE IMPACT OF TITLE III FUNDS ON DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS--A DISCUSSION

The areas of curriculum development and faculty development are clearly seen as the major areas of concern. However, judging by the questionnaire data, administrative improvement has not been neglected either, and a fairly large number of direct-grant institutions regard counseling as a critical area as well. While direct-grant institutions seem concerned about the relative under-development of their counseling services, it is surprising that only about half of these institutions have even submitted proposals for the improvement of these services. Once these colleges improve their curricula and the quality of their teaching, the development of adequate student services would clearly seem to be the next priority.

Direct-grant institutions are clearly part of a comprehensive funding strategy that assumes different results for different types of grants. The overall conclusion of our review is that the differences between direct-grant and consortium-related funding is minimal, in terms of areas of program, monies spent, and results obtained. However, our case study data indicates that direct-grant institutions do tend to be more self-directed and entrepreneurial in their perspective.

This suggests that institutions might be expected to move from consortium-related programs to direct-grant opportunities, assuming that the successful award of a direct grant is an indicator that an institution may be approaching the "take-off" stage.

ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDY DATA

CHAPTER 19

CASE STUDY ANALYSIS *

Our case study Title III institutions ranged from rather prestigious and eminent universities to the most impoverished colleges in the nation. Altogether there were some two year institutions, some four year, some private, some public, some vocational, and some basically academic; perhaps the only common ground they shared was their participation in Title III, and therefore their common designation as "developing institutions."

Data was collected through interviews with faculty, students, and key administrators at each institution. (See Chapter 2 for descriptions of methodology.) The quality of the interviews varied considerably, but in nearly every case they revealed much useful information about the school and the attitudes of those responding. These responses and observations were developed into case studies by the project staff. The case studies sought to give a general description of the institution at the time of the interview--its status, problems, goals, and ambience, and to analyze the impact of Title III monies on the institution. The case studies make use of faculty, student, and administrator responses,

---

* Throughout this chapter, the term "study" refers to the case study data.

plus the feelings of the interviewers as expressed in their summary rating sheets.

In relation to the 2,500 institutions of higher education, the aims of these institutions could be called modest. They tend to judge their performance on the success of their graduates in obtaining jobs or in successfully transferring to four-year institutions. Many times they must perform services not always expected of all institutions of higher education--such as the teaching of reading and basic mathematics.

But despite these and other similarities, the differences between the institutions were often far more striking. Their ability to use Title III funds effectively varied as widely as did the quality of the education they offered. In an attempt to organize the interview data, we have developed a conceptual model to differentiate the institutions by "stages of development."

We realize the dangers of generalizing from clinical studies, especially clinical studies which are as sketchy as ours sometimes were. We have taken great pains to make careful and cautious generalizations, even to the point of making our viability measures less complete than they probably should be. Nevertheless, it is our belief that developing these kinds of cautious and descriptive models is the only way to deal with material as sensitive as that with which we have worked in this case study phase. We are satisfied with the descriptive value of our taxonomy--whether or not it has predictive utility, which is yet to be determined.

Though all developing institutions need money, we have found that all institutions do not use Title III funds equally well. In some schools there seems to be no significant and visible impact resulting from Title III money despite substantial grants. This is obviously due in part to poor administration, but we believe the failures also reflect more complex factors.

By having several staff members read all the case studies, we have broken down the institutions in our case study sample into three general categories: high range institutions, those which readers agree are well on their way to becoming self-sustaining and effective institutions; medium range, those which are developing more gradually and somewhat unevenly and whose future is somewhat less certain; and low range, those which have "a long way to swim before they reach the mainstream," and are presently hampered by very basic problems in their daily operations.

Our three categories of development bear some relationship to the theory of need emergence developed by Maslow, who claimed that "basic" physiological needs for food, shelter, clothing must be satisfied first, then one moves to the needs for security and identity--being loved and needed--then to the higher needs that involve values, stimulation, and risk-taking. We would hypothesize that institutions must move from stage one to stage two in our typology before they can contemplate moving to the "take-off" stage, for reasons which are very similar to Maslow's.

On the basis of the information in the case studies, we were able to place each school into one of these general categories. We then wrote down every item in each case study which we felt might provide a clue to the success or failure of the institution's efforts. Those factors which seemed to recur most frequently in the higher range institutions were labelled as "viability variables." Then each institution was checked against these viability variables through the independent determination of whether the institution ranked as "excellent," "good," "fair," or "poor" in each one. This was not always an easy task, but in nearly every case, the case studies gave clear indications of where the institution stood with respect to each variable. An "excellent" ranking was given infrequently and only in clearly exceptional cases. The "poor" ranking was used far more liberally. We found that for these case studies it was more difficult for readers to distinguish the excellent from the good than to distinguish the poor from the fair.

Analysis of the rankings of course was consistent with our original three-category breakdown--the low range schools scored predominately in the "poor" and "fair" ranges; the medium range schools had many fewer "poor" scores and had a number of "good" scores, and the high range schools had many fewer "fair" scores, only a very few "poor" scores, and several "excellent" scores. (See Table 39, next page.) We found that tabulation of these scores consistently reflected general stages of development. For example, if an institution had more "poor" scores than any other and provided it had less than a couple of "good" scores, the school could be accurately identified as a "low range" institution. The distribution of scores was quite consistent for each school.

TABLE 39

STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT

Low Range Institutions (n = 10)	*Excellent*	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
1. Leadership dynamism	--	10% (1)	30% (3)	60% (6)
2. Financial stability	--	--	30% (3)	70% (7)
3. Range of programs	--	10% (1)	40% (4)	50% (5)
4. Cost-effectiveness	--	--	50% (5)	50% (5)
5. Sense of role	--	10% (1)	60% (6)	30% (3)
6. Students' involvement	--	--	20% (2)	80% (8)
7. Fac.-admin. relations	--	10% (1)	30% (3)	60% (6)
8. Community relations	--	10% (1)	60% (6)	30% (3)
Title III success	--	20% (2)	40% (4)	40% (4)

Medium Range Institutions (n = 19)	*Excellent*	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
1. Leadership dynamism	--	42% (8)	53% (10)	5% (1)
2. Financial stability	--	26% (5)	42% (8)	32% (6)
3. Range of programs	--	21% (4)	42% (8)	37% (7)
4. Cost-effectiveness	--	26% (5)	74% (14)	--
5. Sense of role	--	32% (6)	63% (12)	5% (1)
6. Students' involvement	--	37% (7)	42% (8)	21% (4)
7. Fac.-admin. relations	--	37% (7)	47% (9)	16% (3)
8. Community relations	--	26% (5)	53% (10)	21% (4)
Title III success	--	37% (7)	42% (8)	21% (4)

TABLE 39(continued)

High Range Institutions (n = 12)	*Excel-lent*	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
1. Leadership dynamism	8% (1)	92% (11)	--	--
2. Financial stability	17% (2)	50% (6)	33% (4)	--
3. Range of programs	8% (1)	75% (9)	17% (2)	--
4. Cost-effectiveness	--	75% (9)	25% (3)	--
5. Sense of role	8% (1)	84% (10)	8% (1)	--
6. Students' involvement	--	66% (8)	17% (2)	17% (2)
7. Fac.-admin. relations	--	75% (9)	17% (2)	8% (1)
8. Community relations	25% (3)	50% (6)	17% (2)	8% (1)

Title III success	--	83% (10)	17% (2)	--

We believe that once an institution can be identified by its stage of development, it is easier to identify the most critical problems which the institution faces. Presently, for example, a high range and low range institution might both be given money for the purpose of creating a cultural enrichment program for minority students. While the high range school might succeed at this, the low range school might fail miserably because it faces other and more basic problems (perhaps staffing shortages were keeping one or more of the teachers from devoting proper amounts of time to the program). Because the low range institution was incapable of handling this relatively sophisticated program, this Title III money would have been very poorly and unsuccessfully spent.

We have used eight viability variables in our scoring of these sample institutions. (See Table 40, next page.) They are not of equal weight. The first five--leadership dynamism and efficiency, financial stability, range of programs offered students, cost-effectiveness, and sense of role and long-range direction--seem to be the most consistent and meaningful indicators judging from the statistics developed from readings of the case study texts. Though still important, the other three measures (student demand for involvement and/or outreach to uninvolved students, faculty-administration relations, and community relations) are of more limited value due to their ambiguity and/or lack of scope.

It should be emphasized that standards for all of the eight measures are not absolute. They are relative to the type of school in question. A four-year academic and vocational institution with a "good" range of

TABLE 40

DESCRIPTIONS OF MEASURES OF VIABILITY

1. *Leadership dynamism and efficiency.* This is a measure of the change-orientedness and drive of the administration. "High range" schools are found to have strong, dynamic presidents who are often good fund-raisers. Administrative overlapping, infighting, and/or complacency are causes for low marks on this measure.

2. *Financial stability.* High-scoring schools are relatively secure financially with stable or growing enrollments and with dependable sources of income. Low scorers are marked by continual financial duress, perhaps declining enrollments, and insecurity over future financial matters.

3. *Range of programs and activities offered students.* A wide number of activities such as football and marching band is almost always a great help in bringing students and faculty to a greater interest and involvement in the school, and, most importantly, into closer interaction with one another. These activities are especially important in commuter-type schools where interaction is otherwise very low. Also measured here are the scopes of the academic and cultural programs relative to the needs of the students.

4. *Cost-effectiveness.* This measure is based primarily on how well the school used Title III monies. Were they applied to crucial problem areas with success? Or did the school miss badly on several programs with respect to either where the monies were applied or as to their success? Schools frequently discontinuing programs earn low scores. Also measured in this area are the priorities of the administration. Are they in line with the needs of the students and community?

5. *Sense of role and long-range direction.* A good score is gained on this measure by schools which believe they have a specific task to accomplish, which have clear ideas about where they want to go and how to get there; simply, those which have a sense of self-image. Low scores are given to schools which show confusion over their identity and purpose or whose beliefs about themselves are clearly at variance with the actual performance of the school.

* *

6. *Students' demand for involvement, and/or outreach efforts by the school to uninvolved students.* Many of the best developing institutions have sustained incidents of student demand for involvement in decision-making.

TABLE 40(continued)

This indicates that students want to be involved in the school. A viable institution is also one which consciously reaches out to bring in students previously only marginally attached to it. Cultural programs for minorities are one example of such an effort.

7. *Faculty-administration relations.* In high-scoring schools, administration and faculty tend to socialize with one another and tend to work in relative harmony. Low-scoring schools are found to exhibit much friction between faculty and administration over such matters as salaries, religion, institutional goals, and job security. This measure is not perfect. Often in institutions with great vitality there is considerable controversy and conflict between the two groups, and often some hostility. Also, the faculty and administration are not likely to be close in highly developed institutions like Tuskegee, where the faculty often take more interest in their disciplines than in the institution.

8. *Community relations.* A "fair" score is assumed here unless there is mention of successful community outreach programs or of the strong support of the surrounding community, both of which merit a "good" score. A noticeable lack of community support or signs of the need to gain more community respect is evidence of "poor" standing in the community.

* *

Title III success. This is a rough summary measure which seeks to combine the ideas of impact and effectiveness to give an overall impression of the success of Title III at these institutions.

programs for students would obviously have a broader range of programs than a two-year purely vocational institution which was also given a "good" rating. Similarly, a community junior college would be expected to have somewhat better community relations than a four-year private religious institution in the same area. At the same time, if the religious institution is completely shut off from the surrounding community, that is regarded as one small indication that the school is not interested in enlarging its scope.

1. It is found that institutions with dynamic and forceful Presidents were far more likely to move towards developing than those which were led by complacent and non-energetic administrators. The causality here is obvious; by definition an energetic, dynamic leader is one who can keep the institution moving forward and who can be forceful in solving problems. One important measure of dynamic leadership is the President's interest in fund-raising. In almost every case, if the President was interested in and successful at fund-raising, he was found to have the dynamic spirit in other administrative areas as well. All high range schools received either excellent or good scores on this measure, while 90% of the scores for low range schools fell into either fair or poor rankings--60% were poor.

It is interesting that autocratic decision-making was not necessarily correlated with dynamic leadership. Many institutions show hopeful signs of developing with the arrival of a strong new President who has taken steps to democratize decision-making responsibilities previously held by only one or two men. At the same time there are a couple of cases where a very dynamic President has jeopardized his efforts to develop the school by trying to dominate the students and faculty or by centralizing decision-making. At one institution, the President has made dramatic and progressive changes, but has alienated the faculty by willfully firing several from their ranks, and the students by failing to consult them on the changes. In cases like this, the administration was counted down on the leadership measure. There were a few schools with strong Presidents, but weak and contentious lower-level administrators, or where there was much administrative overlapping. These were occasionally the cause for low scores on this measure. Efficient administration was found to be most important in the effective use of available funds. Whenever important decisions were made by default outside of the school (state agencies, church sponsors, etc.), the institution also received a low score. It was found, without exception, in the few schools where this was the case that this outside decision-making sapped vitality from the school and was very harmful to the development of an institutional self-image, another important viability variable.

2. The financial stability measure was rather easy to judge from the case study data. Those schools suffering financial instability did not hesitate to admit it in hopes of receiving more aid, and those which were not suffering boasted of their stability. If our study provides an accurate representation, few developing institutions have been financially stable during these last few years. Only 14 out of the 41 in our

study were judged as falling in the "excellent" or "good" range on this measure. Financial stability was taken to be an important viability measure on the grounds that those institutions which lack this security are unable to follow through on academic plans, often cannot pay competitive salaries, and are often understaffed and underequipped. At the same time, schools enjoying relative financial stability are under less pressure to maintain only "survival activities," and can, in a sense, psychologically afford to develop. New construction is not always an indicator of financial stability. For example, one school, anticipating an increased enrollment, squandered its endowments on new construction. When it subsequently suffered a drastic drop in enrollment instead, it was seriously imperiled financially.

Financial security alone does not insure institutional success. The study furnishes several examples of institutions which have relatively low cost-effectiveness and relatively high financial stability.

3. The range of programs and activities offered students is another important measure of institutional viability. As explained above, the range-of-programs measure was weighted with respect to size and type of institution. However, even at a small, rural junior college, the needs of students are often broader than might be assumed. We were also concerned in this measure with the range of activities the institutions offered their students. When students merely turn in their hours in class and have no other interest in or attachment to the school, they can be expected to be bored and uninterested in the institution. The

case studies indicate that activities are an important factor in improving student morale, in bringing both students and faculty to a greater interest and involvement in the school, and, most importantly, into closer interaction with one another. This was a recurrent pattern in our study --when football and marching band or other like activities are introduced, student morale jumps and students begin to take a greater interest in the school, both of which are important for developing institutions. Other schools mentioned that their basketball teams were the most important "cohesive force" on campus. Activities seem to be most important for and least common at commuter-type schools where outside-of-class interaction is otherwise extremely limited.

4. Cost-effectiveness is an important measure for determining the general impact of Title III monies, as well as in helping to determine the viability of developing institutions. The bulk of the data for the determination of judgments on this measure came from information concerning the success or failure of Title III programs at the study institutions. We used a number of criteria in this evaluation, including speculation as to whether the Title III money was allocated to and spent in an area appropriate to the priority problems of the school, and, if warranted, to those of the surrounding community as well. Such judgments cannot help but be debatable, given the limitations of our data sources.

Not surprisingly, only 15 of the 41 schools in the study fell into the "good" range on this measure. This does not mean that at the remaining 26 institutions Title III had no impact; only that in some of them the impact could have been greater if administration of the funds had been more successful or if the funds had been applied elsewhere. In other cases, the cost-effectiveness judgment was based partially on non-Title III programs mentioned in the case studies. For example, some institutions that began new programs and then dropped them received low scores on this measure.

In fact, five more of the schools received "good" ratings for their use of Title III funds than received "good" ratings on this cost-effectiveness measure. Thus, in our opinion, nearly half (20 out of 41) of the schools used their Title III monies with "good" success. Another 15 schools used the money with "fair" success and the remaining six used the funds poorly or ineffectively. (Evaluation was adjusted to reflect the amounts of money received by each institution.)

The breakdown by stages for overall use of Title III funds was as follows:

	Good	Fair	Poor
Low Range (10)	1	5	4
Medium Range (21)	11	8	2
High Range (10)	8	2	0

As in the cost-effectiveness scale, "poor" scores resulted principally from evidence of quick discontinuance or bungling of programs and from other evidence of failure to successfully use most Title III resources. "Good" scores were given for successful application of resources to priority needs.

5. The final "first order" measure of institutional viability deals with whether the institution possesses a sense of its role in education and in the community, and whether it shows a commitment to long-range development goals. For example, at one campus, one chief administrator remarked, "Our change in title from college to University has really given us a task--to live up to that title." On the other hand, one President reported that the role of the school was "to provide personalized and high quality teaching attention to students," yet it was clear from other interviews that the performance-orientation of the teaching staff was very depersonalized and perfunctory. This discrepancy earned the school a low score on this "sense of role" measure. In other cases, the respondents were unable or unwilling to verbalize any sense of a role they wished to play in education or in their community, and for this also the institution was penalized with a low score on this measure. Schools lacking this sort of self-image seemed unable to organize their programs in meaningful ways. The correlation between cost-effectiveness and sense of role was high. Nearly 65% of the schools had the same scores on both measures. When an institution voluntarily conducted several small self-studies or one major self-study within the last six years, this was regarded as evidence that the institution was taking its role in education seriously. Without a sense of role, institutions will be unable to develop the selective negligence that goes with cost-effectiveness.

6. Student demand for involvement, and outreach efforts by the school, is the first of the more ambiguous measures. This item depicts several dimensions of student involvement, although in an ambiguous manner. Most of the schools in the study have experienced student demonstrations centered around demands for more involvement in decision-making and/or other institutional affairs. These demonstrations were regarded as positive viability factors since they suggested to us a high level of student loyalty and interest in the institution. We inferred that student apathy in relation to institutional governance generally indicated a marginal attachment and interest in the school and could reflect a lack of vitality in the teaching process as well. The other component--outreach to uninvolved students--obviously suggests institutional commitment to participation. But this was not really common enough to merit a separate category. This measure was scored as follows: significant instances of "student demands" or of efforts at "outreach" were scored as "good"; if there were some instances of either, the institution received a "fair" score; and if there were no instances of either, the institution received a "poor" score.

Another reason why this measure may be less useful than some of the others is that the results from our study do not statistically differentiate the aggregate of "medium range" schools from the aggregate of "high range" schools. They do, however, distinguish the "low range" schools from the higher range schools.

7. In high scoring schools, administration and faculty tend to socialize with one another and tend to work in relative harmony. In low scoring schools, there tends to be much unproductive friction between faculty and administration over such matters as salaries, religion, institutional goals, and job security. At religious institutions there was often friction between religious administrators and lay faculty members, while at women's institutions the male teachers often reported feeling "left out." However, this measure was also less than perfect. Often in institutions with great vitality, there was considerable controversy and conflict between the two groups and often some hostility. Complacency can be more detrimental to a developing institution than controversy. This point is illustrated by one case study institution where the move towards the adoption of a new "life needs curriculum," their most innovative program, was the final result of emotionally charged meetings between the faculty and administration. This conflict indicated a real involvement in the issue, which was later the basis for increased rapport. Similarly, at highly developed "developing institutions" the faculty and administration are not likely to be close, since the faculty will take more interest in their specific disciplines than in the institution as a whole. Despite these qualifications, the measure is easily justified. We found that when the faculty at most developing institutions is hesitant to follow the administration's leadership for one reason or another, they do not generally confront the issue politically. Instead, their dissesion is often transferred to their teaching. Because

this occurred so frequently, it is important for the faculty and administration to be working in relative harmony.

8. A "fair" score on the community relations measure was assumed unless there was mention of successful community outreach programs or of strong support for the college from the surrounding community, both of which merited a "good" score. A mention of lack of community support or of the need to gain more community support was regarded as evidence of "poor" standing in the community. Poor standing in the community can be a very crucial factor for a "low range" institution. The survival of small colleges, especially community colleges, is often dependent on the backing of the immediate community. Obtaining that support where it is lacking can be the single most important priority for these schools. This measure may lose its significance somewhat for higher range schools. However, considering our total group. it is the differentiation of the "low range" schools from the "medium range" schools to which the measure fails to contribute, while it does seem to help differentiate the lower range schools from "high range" schools.

Taken as a whole and with careful reading, we think these variables can give a reasonably accurate picture of a developing institution's "stage of development." (The Reader is encouraged to try out the typology on the case studies in Part II.) We will now try to describe in detail how this careful analysis can be done, what a school needs in order to move from one stage to another, and what value all this can have for Title III administrators.

To recapitulate, we have found that for conceptual purposes, developing institutions can be grouped into one of three "stages of development." If the institution receives a majority of "poor" ratings for the eight variables, and provided that it receives no more than a couple of "good" ratings, or if it has a mix of "fair" and "poor" scores with no "good" scores, than it can accurately be identified as a "low range" institution. If an institution receives a majority of "fair" ratings with perhaps a mix of "good" and "poor" ratings on the remaining measures, then it can be regarded as a "medium range" institution--provided that neither "good" nor "poor" scores dominate the "first order" variables. Finally, if the school scores primarily in the "good" range with some "fair" scores and perhaps some "excellent" scores as well, and provided that it has no more than one "poor" score on the "first order" variables, then it can safely be regarded as a "high range" institution.

We believe the allocation process can be improved once institutions have been categorized in this manner. The purpose of Title III has been to enable developing institutions to move into the mainstream of higher education. Following our model, the purpose of Title III might be more realistically seen as enabling developing institutions to move from their present stage of development to the stage just higher. In line with this approach, Title III might review the funding proposals of colleges in each of the three stages quite differently. A "low range" school is one that is either not developing or is developing much too slowly for the needs of its clientele. The kinds of questions that should be asked about these institutions are the most basic: Are they paying their bills? Admitting students? Are their placement figures high enough to indicate that they are doing a minimally satisfactory job in preparing vocational students? Are teachers competent? Is there a problem with understaffing? Does the institution have the support of the surrounding community? Is there an institutional self-image and mission?

It seems to us that certain of the variables are more important for schools at one level of development than they might be for schools at another. As noted above, "community relations" can be of crucial importance to a "low range" school. Also, "faculty-administration relations" would seem to be a much more meaningful measure for those institutions at which cooperation on this level is especially important. The "sense of role," "leadership dynamism," and "range of programs" variables, we think, are also of key importance in answering the most basic questions about development and are the most meaningful for the purpose of isolating where the major development problems relevant to Title III are to be found for each "low range" institution.

Title III cannot hire new presidents for these schools or pay their teachers higher salaries, but Title III can solve some basic survival problems. In order to do so, Title III should deal pragmatically with the major priority problems at these schools first, and leave the more colorful "showcase" programs for the higher range institutions. If leadership is a major problem, Title III should provide specific assistance for each administrative area. Similarly, Title III can fund self-studies for "sense of role" confusion, add fields of concentration in inadequate curricula, perhaps assist in creating the position of activities director for "uncohesive" campuses, and fund community service programs where community relations are critically poor.

We realize, of course, that Title III cannot analyze each applicant institution with the depth our case studies have allowed. A questionnaire can indicate an institution's place in our typology only incompletely. But it is true that many of the factors which emerge from the case studies as being most important (e.g., leadership and sense of institutional mission and role) are not currently being assessed at all in the Title III application process. Serious consideration might be given to better assessment of the standing of applicant institutions on some of these crucial dimensions. This, of course, might mean additions to the Title III Washington office for staff and travel, plus some revision of the Title III application forms.

It is our feeling that "low range" institutions should receive more than a proportionate share of available Title III funds. Their cost-effectiveness will generally be lower and their needs greater. In order to improve the institution's cost-effectiveness, it is probably a good practice to built the amounts annually rather than showering the school with large amounts at the beginning. We would also emphasize the need for an accountability procedure built into the funding agreement, since the administrators and the faculty of these institutions are sometimes inclined to use funds improperly.

A "LOW RANGE" INSTITUTION PROFILE

The following profile from a case study of a typical "low range" institution, with its many basic problems, might serve well as an explanatory model. This school was integrated in 1964. Title III brought in consultants to help minimize friction during integration. The consultants' proposals were partially successful. However, black students still feel alienated from the school, and their desires for more vocational courses have not been adequately met. Another important concern, despite adult education and other community articulation programs presently in operation at the school, is the need to gain community support. There is some administrative in-fighting and an apparent lack of success in bringing minority students into the mainstream of the school. Title III has reportedly helped the teaching effort greatly through the funding of workshops, allowing time off for advanced study, and by bringing in outside consultants. Title III also has funded an Educational Media Center which seems somewhat out of line with the direction of the school, a cultural series for the community which failed badly, a developmental learning program which "never got off the ground," and materials for counseling services and consortium efforts which have been limited by ill feelings and distrust.

It seems clear that Title III might have been more effectively used on this campus. Funds should have been applied to specific administrative improvements and to development of the vocational track. In addition, consultants were needed to develop good student services, to discuss racial relations with the administrative staff, and to look into the improvement of community relations. The money originally directed towards the Media Center, the cultural series for the community, and possible the counseling materials, might have gone towards programs in those areas--and could have been so directed had this school been identified as a "low range" institution. The developmental learning program was a priority concern for the institution and might have failed because of inadequate funding. Remedial efforts are "high risk" generally and need large amounts of funds to succeed, when they can succeed at all.

Title III at this campus was used inappropriately when funds were used for "showcase" programs, such as the Educational Media Center and the cultural series. To repeat, Title III should insist that "low range" institutions engage in programs directed towards meeting only basic priority problems, should help these institutions become aware of their options, should be willing to spend relatively large amounts in helping these institutions develop, and should make sure there is an accountability procedure built into the funding agreement.

The only other concern about "low range" institutions is whether there might be some that are so lowly and incompetent that it might be useless to channel money to them, no matter what the amount. There are some schools that operate on a very limited budget which could not possibly use large amounts effectively at first, but we did not find any college in our study to be both completely "undeveloped" and "undeveloping."

"Medium range" schools can be identified in the same way as "low range" institutions. In general, "medium range" schools should be more easily and economically moved to a higher stage than "low range" institutions. The reasons are apparent. These are schools that, for one reason or another, have not yet reached the "take-off point," the point where they are competent in all basic areas and could be considered "high range" institutions. Yet they are closer by far to reaching that point than the "low range" institutions. To reach the take-off point, the college must improve all "poor" scores on the viability measures to at least "fair" and should have "good" or "excellent" scores on the "leadership dynamism," "sense of role," and "range of programs" measures as well. A "good" score on the "student demands" scale is an added plus, as are "good" scores on the other two more ambiguous measures, though they are still less important. Less money should be required overall to move "medium range" institutions to the higher stage than to move "low range" institutions to the higher rung, and, of the three ranges, the money required may in fact be the least, since "high range" institutions will sometimes need rather large amounts of money to finance their specialized and more ambitious programs.

A "MIDDLE RANGE" INSTITUTION PROFILE

We have also selected a college to illustrate a "medium range" institution's relationship with Title III. This is a small, rural, junior college which traditionally attracts "low ability" students; 70% of the students transfer, and the remaining 30% receive terminal degrees. The once inadequate terminal program has expanded and will continue to do so if funds are available. Major problems are in the lack of minority representation on the staff and faculty, dissatisfaction on the part of some faculty, and a campus that is not "closely knit." Title III has awarded relatively large amounts of funds to this college, and for the most part those funds have produced major advances. The Title III remedial program has reportedly worked quite successfully. The faculty released-time program has improved faculty morale, and the administrative conferences have yielded marked improvements in the governing and administration of the school. On the other hand, the Title III-funded development office failed, the consultants and faculty workshops were recorded as being of little value, and participation in the consortium is seen as something of an imposition. Because of increased demands for remedial services, additional staff must be added; and there is some desire to add more terminal programs and job placement services. To move this campus securely into the "high range" category, Title III would probably have to continue faculty development efforts, seek to improve the minority hiring at the institution, and perhaps bring in consultants to investigate ways of strengthening the interaction on campus through non-academic activities and programs. Though all of the successful programs appear to have been responses to priority needs, some of the failed programs appear to have been "frills."

The "high range" schools are those that have made it in a modest way and no longer need to worry constantly about obtaining "general support" funds. However, most of them express concern about all funds all the time, to the extent that it sometimes seems as if worry must be a viability factor in itself. In any case, "high range" institutions have less serious problems than the others and can handle large amounts of money successfully in the development of autonomous and ambitious "special interest" programs.

The question will arise as to when a "developing institution" of this type is no longer a "developing institution" but has joined the mainstream of "developed" institutions. Our study contained two schools, and possibly three, that by any standard would have to be considered "mainstream" institutions. Certainly they are still developing, in the broad sense of the word, but in that sense so are Yale, Berkeley, and Harvard. Perhaps a good definition of a developed "developing institution" is that institution which would not fall out of the mainstream if past levels of Title III funds were immediately cut back to nothing. By this measure, only one institution could still be considered a developed institution. Several others are dependent on high levels of federal funding and would suffer greatly without Title III support. With the highest level "high range" institutions it is important that Title III reduce annual funds gradually. Otherwise, Title III stands in danger of nursing strong institutions indefinitely, thus failing its real program goals and the needs of the less well-endowed institutions. In other cases, it seems to us that "high range" institutions will be needing rather large amounts of money in order to develop the kinds of special pre- and para-professional programs found in many first-rank universities.

A "HIGH RANGE" INSTITUTION PROFILE

We will now look more closely at a "high range" institution. Everything this institution has done with Title III has been successful and seemingly well applied. They have expanded their sociology department, allowed many faculty released time, started a successful cultural series, symphony orchestra, and choir, developed a working remedial program for the increasing numbers of "lower ability" students the school is beginning to accept, and worked very successfully on consortium conferences and workshops. The college has no pressing needs; students, faculty, and administration all seem happy with the school's recent development and with the prospects for the future. Since the expansion of the sociology department, there has been some desire to expand other academic and trade departments as well. This school was described as a "good, warm, small college capable of producing outstanding graduates." Title III funds have been decreasing since 1968. This seems to be the right approach, since the school is getting stronger every year despite these smaller grants, and since alumni and other giving has grown appreciably during that time.

Not surprisingly, Title III has often had a profound impact on some institutions in our study that have received a great deal of assistance, and has had generally less impact on those institutions that have received less assistance. However, consistency of funding is of great importance as well. In some cases, Title III assistance has seemed to transform schools into completely different sorts of institutions. Title III has effected mergers, helped move schools into more relevant institutional commitments, and given a new "lease on life" to many tired, faltering institutions. In other, less successful, cases it has pushed an institution out of its routine role, but only to a point where the institution can not return to its comfortable past yet does not have a clear idea of "what to do or where to go now." Perhaps there is not the institutional drive present to respond positively to the push, although the school will usually continue to be artifically driven through Title III economic assistance as long as that assistance lasts. This is not, in the long run, particularly effective. One of the major purposes of Title III assistance should be to build the kind of internal drive that can effectively handle external resources. We believe analysis of some of the viability variables we have isolated can help with this task.

In reviewing some of the programs of our case institutions, we have found several pervasive trends. One is that the quickest way to boost short-term faculty morale is to allow faculty time off to return to school for graduate study. This is perceived as a universally successful program on the campus--at small schools as well as at "developed" ones. Where it is necessary to improve faculty morale quickly, this has proven to be a very effective way of doing the job. (Whether or not teaching is improved is another question.)

In an effort to prove the loyalty and commitment of the teaching staff, administrators and faculty often point to low faculty salaries and remark that the faculty must be committed if they stay on despite low compensation. It is more likely, however, that these teachers simply lack ambition or ability. This is probably not good for the school, despite what the staff may say about commitment. Care should be taken in selecting which faculty members to send back to school. In addition, short-term released time grants for the improvement of specific courses might yield more favorable results.

Several schools have used administrative improvement funds successfully. Thanks to an in-service training grant, one such school was able to send several key administrators to a conference on "Team Concepts in Administration." Following that conference, a previously contentious and disorganized administration was able to begin to work more smoothly with one another and to recognize and respect jurisdictional boundaries. Also following that conference, decision-making was greatly democratized. The improvement in administration at the school was mentioned by all interview respondents. With a sensitivity to the needs of the college, Title III sometimes can precipitate major advances with small amounts of money (here the only money used was for the conference registration fee and travel to the conference).

Our case studies suggest that two of the most difficult areas for successful use of Title III funds are in the use of outside consultants and in the development of remedial programs. Several of the schools have used consultant services for special problems, but few have used them with consistent success. One problem is that the consultants are not on the scene on a continuous basis to ensure the implementation of the new ideas.

However, there do seem to be some clues to successfully designing future remedial programs, to the extent that this responsibility is not subsumed by the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program. First, it seems that most schools engaged in remedial efforts are not asking for, and therefore not receiving, enough money to do the job properly. There is a very high incidence of failure with these efforts. It should not be surprising that these programs require rather large amounts of money--educating the student who has been turned off to school for many years is not an easy task. It requires specially trained personnel, proper media, the right attitudes, counseling and other support efforts, and a real institutional commitment to the idea. One school that functions well in this area may illustrate what can be done. Its program offers 75 selected students intensive remedial and counseling assistance with specially trained personnel. From our view, it seems that programs which do not combine counseling services simultaneously with remedial services are far less likely to succeed, and those that are not adequately staffed with specially trained personnel are even less likely to succeed.

Nearly every school in our case study sample--even the "high range" schools--had real trouble with their counseling services. The reason for these troubles varied, but it does seem that this is an area where Title III might do more. It can be a very important area--for example, when a vocational school has low placement figures due to inadequate counseling and placement services, or when, as noted above, counseling services are not coordinated with remedial services.

Once an institution has achieved some stability in basic areas of development, we have suggested that it will be ready to move on to special programs. This may mean building a special new field of concentration from scratch. One college which successfully used funds for special programs developed an entirely new plan for its future. The integrating force at this campus is the Appalachian environment within which the college is situated. By studying the concerns of Appalachian student life needs with Title III funds, this institution has been able to develop a curriculum directly related to Appalachian culture and that culture's relationship to the outside society, and to work intensively with the Appalachian community in "outreach" programs. The project worked because the staff of the college became philosophically committed to it and were thorough in their preparation, and because before beginning study of the question, the college was already sound in finance, administration, faculty, and student services areas. It was ready to move into new areas and to take some risks.

In concluding this chapter, one or two basic impressions from the case study data should be emphasized. Title III should attempt to recognize where an applicant institution is in terms of its "stage of development" before allocating funds to assist the institution specifically in meeting its needs. Several of the institutions lack specificity in terms of what they want to do, and some Title III monies are not being spent for the purposes for which they were intended. Some of these problems could be alleviated if the application procedures used in Title III, as well as the monitoring procedures used after the grants are given, would be made to reflect the location of each institution on some sort of developmental time-line. We hope that our five basic viability variables can be useful descriptive and diagnostic tools for this purpose.

Although there was a relationship between size of grant and impact of Title III funds on campus development, we found some instances of a small allocation producing spectacular results. Generally, this is the consequence of a personal dedication to a program on the part of an individual or individuals on the specific campus, and the money serves a psychological purpose which may be as important as its other values. But without local leadership, even large amounts of Title III money can be spent without any consequences. We found very few campuses in which the Title III coordinator was spending large amounts of time on Title III work. It seems that campus leadership potential is probably the most important single characteristic in distinguishing the successful Title III programs from the less successful ones.

Institutions in the "low range" of institutional development can not be considered on cost-effectiveness terms, as they are usually casting about for a sense of institutional mission, which is ordinarily necessary before institutions can make cost-effective decisions. It takes more support to move an institution from "low" to "medium" than from "medium" to "high," and a greater risk must be taken. Given the kinds of institutional needs we have described for institutions at the low viability level, larger amounts of Title III funds should be directed toward the needs of these institutions. However, the low-level institutions should be accountable for implementing the programs that make the best sense, given their level of development.

We also discovered several institutions in our study that were clearly ready to move into more specialized and stimulating programs. The concept of a developing institution should be broad enough to permit a campus to develop some really fresh and vital new program thrusts, as this is also a way of reaching toward the "mainstream" and of providing models for emulation by other institutions which have not yet reached that take-off point.

CHAPTER 20

CONSORTIA AS REFLECTED IN THE CASE STUDIES

This chapter will be fairly brief, as we have already reported on the questionnaire data on consortia earlier in this report. That data reported fairly optimistic feelings on the part of questionnaire respondents (usually administrators) with regard to the effectiveness of consortium activities.

But things are a little different on the campuses. Our case study group of 41 campuses provided us with data on 14 consortia. Many of the consortia were reported as not functioning very well, for a variety of reasons. Small, proud institutions often resent what they perceive as condescending attitudes on the part of larger institutions in the consortium. (Reported by two of the campuses in our case study group.) Sometimes distances between schools, or differences in institutional size and mission were too great to allow optimal cooperation. (This was also reported at two institutions, not the same two as above.) In two other cases, funding of the consortium was regarded as insufficient to allow for the development of effective programs that would benefit the individual campuses. We found that most faculty respondents on campus were almost totally ignorant of the Title III involvement with the consortium, and often they were not aware of the consortium itself, which seemed to act as liaison between the chief administrators of institutions. Few consortia had established liaisons at the faculty level, and almost none at the student level. It may be that consortia, as well as individual institutions, have developmental patterns of growth, but we could not detect any pattern of increasing participation by various campus groups in consortium activity. We also could not detect factors that made the difference in their performance. In five consortia, the pattern seemed to be an early emphasis on building the consortium, followed by a period of decreasing faith in the consortium and a period of emphasis on building the individual institutions--with the consortium serving only as a fiscal agent for disbursement of funds. In five cases, there were charges that consortia coordinators played favorites among the cooperating institutions. (Such charges were made in almost all institutions that belonged to consortia, but not with any frequency aside from the five cases mentioned.)

On the brighter side, four consortia seemed to be operating fairly well from the campus perspective. They had provided successful services such as course exchanges, guest lecture programs, joint hiring of faculty, and joint studies of admissions problems and other administrative problems. One consortium has been very successful in organizing curriculum workshops, a visiting professors program, and development offices on each campus. On these campuses the consortium is well known by faculty, and is perceived as a friendly agent. Consortium leadership is seen as supplementary to, rather than subversive of, campus leadership.

One consortium stands out. This group of eight schools in New England has banded together to fend off financial instability and has so far succeeded. All routine administrative tasks are carried out through the consortium. Library transports move books between campuses daily, creating one mobile "library" for the consortium of institutions. Joint course numbering allows frequent student exchange of courses. In addition, a common 4-1-4 calendar, a marine sciences program, and a number of cultural exchange programs produce a genuine multiplier effect, providing resources that no single campus could manage. These schools are now committed to interdependence. This manifest function has produced some latent functions as well--for example, the religiously controlled institutions in the consortium have, for the first time, adopted a relatively contemporary approach to many educational issues, thanks to their consortium associations. But this has increased institutional identity, as these new ways of doing things had to be translated into the institution's milieu. Indeed, the identity of these institutions may actually be stronger because of the consortium.

We realize there are serious policy issues regarding the amounts of Title III monies to be allocated through consortia compared to the amount allocated in direct grants. Both funding statuses have their successes and failures. But there have been some particularly spectacular failures in consortium "showcase" programs designed to increase the visibility of the consortium rather than to improve the educational quality of the member institutions. Consortium requests should be oriented towards sharing the strengths of the existing institutions or towards centralizing routine administrative tasks to cut costs. Accountability of funds spent by a consortium must be clear.

Many of the consortia were characterized by great diversity of member characteristics and geography, which severely limited meaningful "grass roots" collaboration. Some homogenizing of consortium members may make success more possible. In addition, consortium directors must be very careful not to be perceived as usurping power from the local campus faculty and administration.

Many of our consortia received funds from many sources in addition to Title III. This not only makes for difficulties in analyzing the effectiveness of Title III monies through consortia, but it also means that auditing of Title III monies is difficult in many cases.

Yet with all the problems inherent in Title III consortium efforts, we found the underlying theory to be useful and the programs successful in many cases. But, as with institutional support, more precise specification, more sophisticated planning, and increased accountability are necessary. We recommend that both consortia and direct grant funding strategies be maintained. As with individual institutions, we found several cases in which a consortium produced excellent results with relatively few collars, and other cases in which large sums produced virtually no results. The relationship of bang to buck is far from perfect. Certainly, consortia need to be seen as means, not as ends, as service agencies rather than as usurpers of institutional vitality and initiative.

CHAPTER 21

SOME GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE UTILITY AND CONSEQUENCES OF TITLE III FUNDS FOR "DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS", 1965-66 to 1970-71

At the beginning of the funding period, it was clear that a large number of institutions in the Developing Institutions program were in real danger of extinction. Given the average three-year period in which institutions received Title III funding, it is also clear that by the end of the three-year period, many institutions in the Title III group had made considerable strides toward institutional soundness of operation, as well as an increased sense of purpose and self-direction. Our difficulty of course, is in attributing this *entirely* to Title III, in that, as we have seen, over half of the programs reported were supported heavily from other sources as well as from Title III. The program officers should make a greater effort to know what other sources of money are being used in the areas in which Title III operates. We had the feeling that in several institutions, two grants for a single purpose would not have been given, had each of the two funding agencies been aware of the other award.

In general, we were impressed with the similarity in terms of priorities and practices between coordinators of consortia, participating institutions, and direct-grant institutions. We could find no characteristically different way in which funds or programs were handled, and came to the general conclusion that the three types of funding were not producing significant differences in results. We shall now discuss some common concerns that we found to be characteristic of all Title III programs.

A. POOR GENERAL CURRICULA

Developing institutions apparently are very aware of the relative narrowness of their course offerings. Title III offered them a chance to improve this situation at relatively low cost, both through faculty workshops and through the National Teaching Fellowship program. The NTF's were usually called upon not only to teach traditional courses but in addition to introduce new teaching methods and to develop new curricula. Almost all the responding institutions hired NTF's in several fields to strengthen the curriculum as a whole rather than using them only to improve one marginal department. Institutions will not be happy with the demise of the NTF program. There is no doubt that this program was seen by many as the single most important assistance provided by Title III. On the other hand, it also suggests that the best way to improve institutions is to bring in outside expertise, rather than to "grow your own." Given this, it may be that the Title III staff is right, and the institutions are wrong, in that "Phase two" in adapting to new conditions must rest with those faculty members who will stay with an institution for an extended period of time, rather than with the visitor from outside, who will leave shortly after making what clearly was an important contribution. Perhaps the NTF program represented an early stage in institutional maturation which will be less needed in the future than it was in 1965-66.

The fact that the Professors Emeriti program never got off the ground is probably not just a reflection on the relatively small supply of retired professors who are willing to go back to teaching. Clearly, the developing institutions have indicated through their often enthusiastic endorsement of the NTF program that they want young academics with fresh ideas and people for whom teaching has not yet become a routine activity. Thus, it may be that institutions put too much weight on the NTF's for revising curriculum and methods of teaching, which should have been an institution-wide activity. We were impressed with the number of times some reference was made to the importance and benefits of visiting another campus for both faculty and administrators, and our hope is that Title III can make this opportunity more available as time goes on. There is little doubt also that the NTF program helped many institutions provide released time for the regular faculty in order to obtain advanced degrees. Whether obtaining the advanced degree made them any better as teachers or not, we of course cannot say. But it would be hard to argue that the possession of an earned doctorate would damage anyone's teaching ability very much.

B. INSUFFICIENT REMEDIAL PROGRAMS

We were concerned with the small number of institutions that took remediation seriously through Title III. (This may be, again, that they were receiving funds from other sources in this area and thus preferred to use their Title III resources in areas that could not be funded in another way.) Developing institutions as a group may not have larger proportions of entering freshmen with academic deficiencies, but it would seem that they are likely to find it harder to cope with the problem of providing these remedial programs. Some colleges receiving Title III assistance have realized that one or two remedial courses is basic skills, such as English, may not be enough to integrate students with deficiencies into the regular curriculum. Many have begun setting up counseling programs that supplement the special curricular efforts and link personal and academic counseling into a single office. The case studies report a fair number of learning resource centers, student services centers, student counseling centers, etc. This is an urgent national need for many institutions that are not in the Title III program, and might be an area in which Title III could make a real contribution, if significant progress were made toward the development of effective models of remedial programs. We hope that the Title III program can make greater efforts in this area in the future.

C. LACK OF ADEQUATE ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES

A good record-keeping system, as well as a good record-retrieval system, is now a necessity for all institutions of higher education. An institution that has an adequate level of self-knowledge can be managed more easily and more rationally than a college in which vital information about the institution is known to only a very small number of people.

As colleges have come to realize the importance of self-knowledge, they have become more inclined to establish mechanisms to deal with the problem. Particularly this involves the establishment of offices of institutional research and better coordination between existing offices in terms of sharing information. Of the 175 new offices begun under Title III auspices, most were either institutional research or development offices. Of the rather large number started, our interview and case study data does not report instances of these offices failing after the initial start.

More often than not, a Title III grant for the establishment of such offices was a one-time seed grant. The college that set up the office then would have to find the means to support the office by itself after the seed grant had been used up. Unlike the institutional research office, the development office does, or at least should, pay for itself in a short time. Title III has helped a fairly large number of colleges set up development offices which, if properly run, might make the difference between an institution's survival and its demise. As we said, we have no reports of failures in these offices, and we assume that most institutions have been able to fund them out of their resources after Title III had initiated their creation.

D. PROGRAM AUTONOMY

On of the major difficulties we saw was that the funding agent perceived of the Title III programs as being autonomous, while the individual institution felt perfectly free to put together combinations of funding to create a particular program. Thus, the Title III office seldom got any awareness of the totality of program funding. It was also clear that on most campuses the role of the Title III coordinator was not clearly spelled out, and, as we have reported, in most cases very few hours per week went into this position. If the Title III office had been made more substantial, it might well be that the new programs within the institution would have attained more identity and coherence.

E. LEADERSHIP

We were impressed, both in the case studies and in other data sources, with the enormous importance that leadership in the institution, particularly that of the president, plays in the success of Title III awards. With it, relatively small amounts of money produce great gains, and without it, large amounts of money may produce almost nothing at all. In most of the developing institutions, the leadership must begin with the administration, particularly the president, and then work outward to other administrators, faculty, and students. Given the importance of this dimension, there might be some ways in which Title III could better assess leadership potential before grants were awarded.

F. COST-EFFECTIVENESS

One of the questions that the Title III staff must ask, is:

"What size grant produces the greatest yield with the minimum expenditure of precious federal funds?" The general pattern of the Title III strategy was to provide a large number of grants in the less-than-$20,000 category (particularly in curriculum, administrative improvement, and student services) and a considerably smaller number of bigger grants consisting of over $50,000. The only exception to this is in faculty development, in which more grants in the $20,000-$49,999 category were made than in any other. Although there was a general relationship between the size of grant size of program and "yield," in terms of institutional improvement, the relationship is certainly far from perfect. Indeed, with superb leadership, as we have mentioned, very small amounts of money can produce great things.

Probably more important to the institutional perspective than size of grant is continuity of funding. Many interviews reported real concern with institutions that were beginning new and somewhat risky programs with no assurance of funding past the first year. We are aware of problems in this area, particularly in terms of federal calendars. Certainly the staff does not want to engage in completely multi-year funding, but some percentage, perhaps as large as 50% of the money in the "conventional" Title III grants, should be in the multi-year catergory.

Part of the justification of a cost-effectiveness approach is the use of consortia in Title III. Consortia are clearly designed to be agencies that can produce a "multiplier effect" in that a given number of dollars will produce greater improvement in a larger number of institutions rather than through a consortium. We have found relatively ambiguous evidence to support this claim as the case studies show. On the other hand, consortia do provide a greater diversity of programs than institutions could provide for themselves. The problem with using cost-effectiveness in this particular program is that the outcome of Title III grants are too diverse, including the establishment of marine biology programs, 4-1-4 calendars, a systems approach to administration, the development of new text-books and materials, adding academic counselors and remedial education specialists as well as remedial programs, introduction of arts and humanities courses, the existence of guided studies programs, and the establishment of new administrative offices as well as writing clinics and new physical science programs. These new elements usually could be shown to be a significant addition to the campus repertoire, but make cost-effective decisions or judgments difficult to arrive at because of the diversity of program outcomes. An additional problem in relation to cost-effectiveness is our inability to recommend "ideal" sized grants for particular jobs to be done. This seems to be an area in which much more research could successfully be accomplished. However, we do feel confident in recommending that larger amounts of Title III money should be awarded in the form of multi-year grants. We would hope also that the remedial and student services areas could be enlarged somewhat, in that ultimately any program which keeps a student in school when he is thinking of dropping out may well be the most cost-effective program of all.

The new Title III "option" program comes at precisely the right time, in our view, as a fairly large number of institutions now seem to be getting ready for the "take-off" stage, even though recent discussions of the decrease in numbers of those going on to college suggest that "taking off" may be much more difficult in the rest of this decade than was conceived just a few years ago. And in the original Title III format, with a larger role for the campus Title III coordinator, better awareness of the other funding sources which are used in conjunction with Title III, more supervision and assistance from the Title III staff, and more explicit statements of program goals from the institutions themselves and more focus on institutional leadership, Title III can continue to serve the needs of a broadening spectrum of developing institutions than in the past.

CHAPTER 22

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In submitting this report, we have been asked to perform four different tasks, namely:

1. To develop a profile of "developing institutions" as a segment of American higher education.
2. To do an in-depth study of a sample of individual institutions.
3. To describe and evaluate the impact of Title III for the time period between 1965-66 and 1970-71.
4. To develop indicators of institutional vitality that may be used to determine an institution's eligibility for special program funding under Title III.

The profile part of this report has shown that there is no single characteristic--apart from the fact that they did get Title III funding--which sets the "developing institutions" apart from other comparable institutions of higher education in the United States. About half of the institutions in the survey group were public, the other half were private. The two-year institutions tended to be occupationally oriented, while the four-year colleges were predominantly liberal arts institutions. Our survey group was totally unrepresentative in one respect--black institutions were over-represented both in terms of the universe of Title III institutions and (especially) in terms of the total universe of American institutions of higher education.

"Developing institutions" did indeed develop between 1965-66 and 1970-71 in all areas we examined--student characteristics, faculty characteristics, characteristics of administrators, characteristics of trustees, and selected budget characteristics. While the mean size of full-time enrollments in these institutions was between 500 and 750 students in 1965-66, it had crossed the 1,000 student mark five years later. The faculty at these institutions were academically better qualified as a group in 1970-71 than in 1965-66. Within that time period, the degree of specialization of administrative functions grew considerably, and sizeable numbers of "developing institutions" established administrative offices with new functions aimed at increasing the colleges' chances for survival in the future. Budgets grew considerably in just about all cases--a reflection of increased enrollments.

The in-depth case study of a sample of individual institutions--both colleges and organizations which were instrumental in distributing Title III funds--provided a verification of many of the findings from the questionnaire survey. Most of these institutions seemed to share the main characteristics and problems of similar colleges that did not get Title III funding: financial problems, dropping enrollment rates (primarily in four-year liberal arts colleges) and fast-rising enrollments (primarily in two-year colleges), as well as other problems. Most institutions among our questionnaire respondents seemed to have made efforts to attract more students from low-income and minority groups (one of the pre-conditions for the granting of Title III funds). Some institutions belonging to consortia profitted very much from their association with a Title III consortium, while others were only very marginally involved.

A really valid assessment of the sole impact of Title III proved to be impossible. Most of the programs sponsored by Title III had other funding sources as well--both internal and from private foundations. Thus, it was nearly always impossible to attribute a certain output to Title III in particular. However, it is clear that the "developing institutions" as a group are not "struggling" any longer, as many of them were during the first years of the program's implementation.

The majority of "developing institutions" have been continuously funded for a full cycle of approximately three years and they are now ready to be considered for special Title III grants under the additional appropriation for the establishment of pre-professional training programs. A number of institutions are clearly developed enough to make good use of such funds; another group of institutions which have only started to receive Title III funds for general institutional support purposes are clearly not yet ready for such special funds (this also includes institutions which may be in the middle of the funding cycle). The third (and largest) group of institutions are potentially ready to be considered for such funds because they have had a complete cycle of funding for general institutional support purposes. However, many institutions in this third group may not in fact be able to reach the "take-off" stage at which they represent low-risk candidates for innovative pre-professional programs. A section of this report attempted to discuss a variety of indicators that might be used to measure institutional vitality, the key concept applied in making choices about the allocation of special Title III funds.

Title III of the 1965 Higher Education Act has not been a very visible program either nationally or on the various participating campuses. Many institutions in our study have made suggestions as to how Title III might be adapted to fit their purposes better. A two-way flow of information should be made possible so as to provide the U.S. Office of Education in general, and the Division of College Support in particular, with more input from the individual institutions.

REFERENCES

Badger, Henry G. Colleges That Did Not Survive. *Journal of Negro Education,* 1966, 35(4), 306-312.

Bayer, Alan E., & Boruch, Robert F. The Black Student. *American Council on Education, Research Reports,* 1969, 4(2).

Branson, Herman. Inter-institutional Programs for Promoting Equal Higher Educational Opportunities for Negroes. *Journal of Negro Education,* 1966, 35(4), 469-476.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Carnegie Commission. *From Isolation to Mainstream: Problems of the Colleges Founded for Negroes.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Caro, Francis G. (Ed.) *Readings in Evaluation Research.* New York: Russell Sage, 1971.

Carter, Reginald K. Clients' Resistance to Negative Findings and the Latent Conservative Function of Evaluation Studies. *American Sociologist,* 6 (May, 1971), 118-124.

Coleman, James. *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. *A Compilation of Federal Education Laws.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Division of College Support. Criteria for Identifying a Developing Institution. Memo dated July 1, 1971.

Etzioni, A. Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1960, 5, 257-278.

Fichter, Joseph. *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges: Class of 1964.* Public Health Service Publication No. 1571, 1967.

Filstead, William J. (Ed.) *Qualitative Methodology.* Chicago: Markham Publishers, 1970.

Gurin, Patricia, & Epps, Edgar. Some Characteristics of Students from Poverty Backgrounds Attending Predominantly Negro Colleges in the Deep South. *Social Forces*, September, 1966.

Gurin, Patricia, & Katy, Daniel. *Motivation and Aspiration in the Negro College.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1966.

Hefferlin, JB. *Dynamics of Academic Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Institutions in Transition: A Profile of Change in Higher Education.* New York: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education/McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Howard, Lawrence. *The Developing Colleges Program: A Study of Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965.* Final Report of Project No. 6-1437, U.S. Office of Education. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Huyck, Earl. Faculty in Predominantly White and Predominantly Negro Higher Education Institution. *Journal of Negro Education*, 1966, 35(4), 381-392.

Jaffe, A. J. *Negro Education in the 1960's.* Praeger Special Studies in United States Economic and Social Developments. New York: Praeger, 1968.

Jencks, Christopher, & Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution.* New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Lawrence, Ben, et al. *The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation.* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

McGrath, Earl. *The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition.* New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Publication Bureau, 1965.

Miller, James, & Gurin, Gerald. *Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected "Developing Institutions".* Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 1966.

Patterson, Frederick. Cooperation among the Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities. *Journal of Negro Education,* 1966, 35(4), 477-484.

Peterson, Richard; Centra, John, et al. *Institutional Functioning Inventory: Preliminary Technical Manual.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Rostow, W. W. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Suchman, E. A. Evaluating Educational Programs. *Urban Review,* 1969, 3, 15-17.

Ware, Gilbert. The Federal Dollar, the Negro College, and the Negro Student. *Journal of Negro Education,* 1966, 35(4), 459-468.

Weiss, Carol. The Politicization of Evaluation Research. *Journal of Social Issues,* 1970, 26(4), 57-68.

PART II

CASE STUDIES AND APPENDICES

CONTENTS

PART II, CASE STUDIES AND APPENDICES

Interviewers of the Developing Institutions Study 247

CASE STUDIES OF COLLEGES
(Arranged alphabetically by state)

ALABAMA

Talledega College 249

Tuskegee Institute 254

DELAWARE

Delaware State College 263

GEORGIA

Clark College 269

Morehouse College 274

Morris Brown College 279

Paine College 286

South Georgia Junior College 291

IOWA

Clinton Community College 297

Eastern Iowa Community College 302

KANSAS

Benedictine College 306

Kansas City, Kansas, Community Junior College 311

KENTUCKY

Alice Lloyd College 317
Henderson Community College 323
Lees College 329
St. Catherine College 334

LOUISIANA

St. Mary's Dominican College 340
Xavier University 345

MISSISSIPPI

Copiah-Lincoln Junior College 350
East Central Junior College 356
Meridian Junior College 361

MISSOURI

Park College 368
Rockhurst College 373

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mount Saint Mary College 378
New England College 384
Rivier College 391
Saint Anselm's College 396

NORTH CAROLINA

Barber-Scotia College 401
Elizabeth City State University 405
Johnson C. Smith University 411
Livingstone College 416

OHIO

Bluffton College 422

Defiance College 429

Findlay College 435

Wilberforce University 441

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Christian College 446

PENNSYLVANIA

Lincoln University 452

SOUTH CAROLINA

Benedict College 459

Lander College 464

TEXAS

University of Corpus Christi 470

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield State College 476

CASE STUDIES OF OTHER INSTITUTIONS

American Association of Junior Colleges 482

Division of College Support, USOE 487

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE) 493

Technical Assistance Consortium To Improve College Services (TACTICS) 499

APPENDIX A, Questionnaire 504-556*

APPENDIX B, Interview Agenda 557

APPENDIX C, Computer Print-Out Tables 1 to 331 569-900*

---

*The Questionnaire and the Computer Print-out Tables are numbered internally.

INTERVIEWERS*
of the
DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS STUDY

Fred E. Adams
Instructor of Sociology
Lee College

Leon H. Belcher
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Texas Southern University

Neal Berte
Dean, New College
University of Alabama

D. L. Boger
Chairman, Dept. of Education
Morehouse College

Chester A. Bratton
Dean of Students
Arkansas AM&N College

Claretha H. Carnegie
Counselor
Polk Community College

Don E. Coleman
Assistant to the Dean
Michigan State University

Pearlie C. Dove
Professor of Education
Clark College

Mrs. Jessie Ebanks
Librarian
Morehouse College

Anna H. Grant
Chairman, Dept. of Sociology
Morehouse College

Leonard I. Keller
Director, Division of Education
Southern University in New Orleans

Edward C. Kollman
Dean of Faculty
Hampton Institute

Samuel P. Massie
Professor of Chemistry
U.S. Naval Academy

Rubin McDaniel
Asst. Prof. of Higher Education
Florida State University

Joseph McKelpin
Director of Research
Southern Association of
Colleges and Schools

Vernon McMurray
Chairman, Business and Economic
Division
Arkansas AM&N College

---

*Plus three members of the study staff--Harold Hodgkinson, Walter Schenkel, and Gerald Block.

L. Richard Meeth
Assoc. Prof. of Higher Education
State University of New York
at Buffalo

William R. O'Connell, Jr.
Director of Special Programs
Southern Regional Education Board

Cecil L. Patterson
Dean, Undergraduate School
North Carolina Central University

Robert W. Pitcher
Director
Educational Development Center

Lena B. Prewitt
Assoc. Prof. of Management
University of Alabama

Anthony M. Rachal, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Xavier University

Will Scott
Chairman, Dept. of Sociology
and Social Science
North Carolina A&T State University

Mrs. Will Scott
North Carolina A&T State University

William F. Taylor
Dean of Students
Polk Community College

Charles F. Upshaw
Dept. of Psychology
Michigan State University

Howard E. Wright
Director, Division of Social Sciences
Hampton Institute

Talladega College

(Talladega, Alabama)

In the past, Talladega attracted students whose parents were college graduates and, in many cases, alumni of the institution. Tradition and prestige, as well as training for graduate school or medical training, were the main reasons why students chose to attend this college. Today, tradition and prestige still rank high, but there is an increasingly large number of "first generation" college students attending Talladega. Because more and more middle-to-upper-class blacks have been permitted to enter other four-year institutions in the country, the lower class students come to schools such as Talladega, which provides financial assistance to a large percentage of its students. Students are now being encouraged to go into the non-traditional occupations for blacks, such as business. Teaching, ministry, and medicine are considered the traditional occupations for blacks. There is, indeed, a trend for graduates to go into business and law.

Title III is somewhat responsible for the change in the freshman experience that may have encouraged the first-generation students to remain in college. The Title III-funded Thirteen College Curriculum Program (TCCP), now being "phased into" the school's own budget has upgraded the freshman experience. This program is considered to be most beneficial on campus. Through the freshman and sophomore program, Talladega has been provided with new teaching techniques, new ideas, and a good selection of faculty. In fact, the school is now over-committed with faculty. TCCP has provided opportunities for counseling which have set the standards for the entire school. This program is administered through the ISE (Institute for Service for Education). The major emphasis of the program has been on curriculum and teaching methods.

Participation, with student and faculty exchanges to Dartmouth and Fordham, has done a great deal to upgrade faculty by providing NTF's and relieving faculty in order to continue their graduate work. Talladega faculty attend annual meetings with professional groups at Dartmouth. The chairman of the Dartmouth-Talladega Cooperative Committee had many critical comments to offer. He would like to have the freedom to use the funds in order to choose faculty from sources other than Dartmouth. The reason for this is that Talladega needs more black professors, and Dartmouth does not have any. The cooperation with Dartmouth is limited to their resources and those of Talladega. As this is not satisfactory to the needs of the school, a wider range of selection among resources is needed. The chairman does not like the "big brother-little brother" image projected by this arrangement because the students get the impression that the school has to rely on a "big brother."

Through the Alabama Center for Higher Education (ACHE), Talladega has participated in the Cooperative Program arrangement with Tuskegee in engineering, architecture, and veterinary medicine. Members of the administrative staff at Talladega expressed appreciation for the opportunity to exchange faculty and students and for the interpersonal relationships among students and faculty. They felt that it was good to talk with others who are having the same problems and sharing the same concerns.

Many respondents would like to see more Title III input into ACHE in order to encourage a cooperative relationship and a consortium within the nearby geographical area. Programs within a local consortium would enable Talladega to tap the resources of the University of Alabama in the same way that they tap the resources of Dartmouth. There seems to be a desire to concentrate on programs with schools which Talladega considers to be equals. The administrators feel that these "equal" arrangements are more beneficial to the institution than the "big brother" type arrangement.

According to the archivist, who is also a history teacher, ACHE provides funds for black colleges to purchase college materials on black people for their libraries. The archivist seeks out private collections and encourages alumni to donate funds to help with the oral history projects, which consist of taping interviews of persons in rural areas. Collections of black history are brought over from Africa. The most pressing need now is for travel funds in order to find material with which to write textbooks for blacks.

Talladega also participated in the Moton Development Consortium, which enabled them to hire a secretary and bookkeeper. Training programs were initiated and a part-time aide was added in the alumni office, which is trying to develop a master list of graduates. Title III provided travel monies which enabled staff members to attend conferences.

A placement consortium with Alabama A & M College at Huntsville has provided career counseling and placement services for the students. But there was a suggestion that the college placement be more related to college programs. In the areas of personal counseling, funds are needed for a counseling center to provide clinical psychology and the services of a psychiatrist. One respondent thought that about one-third of the students and some faculty could use such services.

One of Talladega's main concerns is the many black colleges who are asking it to join with them in new programs. Talladega must carefully consider the proposals to make sure that they do not spread themselves too thin and duplicate existing programs.

Talladega makes monthly requests for funds from the National Services Institute, from an approved budget. The check is deposited in various funds,by program, and then the money is transferred out to the college as expenditures are made. Title III funds are audited as part of the annual audit.

If Title III funds were terminated, the Thirteen Colleges Curriculum Program, which operates with very little Title III money, would certainly continue. There are doubts whether or not the Alabama Center for Higher Education would continue, but the Dartmouth-Talladega cooperation and the cultural bookings would stand a good chance of survival.

Apparently the college is hurting for money. Respondents said that although there has been decentralization of decision-making, and although the President ultimately makes decisions, the Dean runs the college. The reason for this is that the President is away most of the time trying to obtain funds for the college. But the President was praised for his hard work in developing a good faculty. The good leadership of the President and his administrative policies have given impetus for good faculty morale and attitudes.

On campus there is good communication between blacks and whites. The black students, who have come to Talladega because they knew that they would feel more at home in a black institution, have learned to be less suspicious of their white teachers. Socializing among students, teachers, and staff is limited to those who make an effort, and apparently town and gown do not mix. In fact, the Talladega College Hills apartments, a non-Title III project, was developed because of the need for quality housing in a community where there is very little integration.

Title III has been a life-saver for Talladega, especially in the case of faculty development and the Thirteen Colleges Curriculum Program. The key administrators and the many faculty members who knew of this federal funding felt that Title III was helping to bring the institution, slowly but surely, into the mainstream of American higher education.

Tuskegee Institute

(Tuskegee, Alabama)

Tuskegee is an atypical developing institution. First, it has a national reputation. Its faculty are engaged in much sponsored research, the school operates international programs, and among its Board of Trustees and Advisory Council can be found several well-known names. Tueskegee is, in many ways, a rather distinguished small college.

On the other hand, Tuskegee is very much dependent on federal funds and foundation grants for supporting many of the most distinguished of its programs. The school receives money from Titles II, III, and V of the Higher Education Act, from many other federal programs, and from the Ford Foundation and the Kellogg Foundation. Annual Title III appropriations to Tuskegee have averaged nearly $400,000 for the last six years.

Without this federal and foundation aid, of which Title III monies are a relatively small part, it is safe to say that Tuskegee would be "just another poor, black, southern school." As it is, this year will be the first in the last six that Tuskegee will operate in the black. Last year the President wrote, "In the past five years, we have been beset by increasing operating deficits that impaired our modest endowment fund by more than $4 million; costs of all operations and some much-needed plant development drained cash and encumbered us with long-term loan commitments."

Tuskegee made its reputation first as a black vocational institution. It still has a strong "vocational bent," but perhaps the most significant change at Tuskegee has been its efforts (in the words of one administrator) "to keep pace with the changing social, economic, and political developments in this country and the changing status of the black man" by turning "more and more to a liberal arts and sciences approach." The remaining agricultural and mechanical programs, even, are being taught more as sciences than as vocations.

The fastest growing department on campus is the business management department, and an increasing number of graduates are going into industry. Teaching, however, remains the most attractive field for graduates.

Changes in the curriculum and physical plant reflect these increasing professional opportunities. The school now has accredited curricula in seven professional areas; those in engineering, architecture and social work have been developed during the last five years. The Engineering Building was only recently completed.

The pains of moving away from the traditional, small, personal, vocational approach are not insignificant. With the professional improvement of the faculty has come a change in their attitude. One administrator complained, "They seem less conscious of being members of the 'Tuskegee family'. . . . They seem to identify more with their disciplines now than with the institution. They're more likely to call the AAUP now, and they don't seem as close to the students as they were previously." Perhaps as a consequence, faculty-administration and faculty-faculty socialization patterns are breaking down. Socializing was not regarded as "pervasive," as is still the case in many developing institutions.

In comparison to the administration, the faculty was more likely to comment on those changes that still needed to be made than to praise those that had already been made. They especially saw a need for monies to allow them to attend professional meetings so they could continue to keep abreast of the latest developments in their fields. They also wanted more learning facilities and "money to hire qualified personnel" so that their "heavy" teaching loads could be reduced. The increasing discipline-oriented specialization of the faculty was apparent elsewhere also. One interviewer observed, "The administrators are more informed than others on campus. The higher one goes up the management scale, the more general the individual's knowledge is of the programs and their effect on the college. By contrast, the faculty are specialized in their knowledge. They generally know about only one or two programs on campus; many times their knowledge is restricted to those programs with which they have had personal contact." In most small schools this is not the case; the faculty will have its opinions about programs whether they have had direct contact with them or not.

Enrollment has dropped at Tuskegee due to the expanded role of the state's junior college system, on one hand, and the increased competition of "white" schools like the University of Alabama in recruiting top black students, on the other hand. In response to this development, and to the related financial crisis, the college conducted an intensive "role and scope study" which was entirely funded by the Ford Foundation. According to the President, the results of the study "reaffirmed Tuskegee's traditional concern for preparing all of the disadvantaged." The study also resulted in the elimination of several unnamed programs.

Though the study seems to have emphasized Tuskegee's role in educating the "disadvantaged," there remains a conflict of attitudes concerning what the school's direction should be. In many ways, Tuskegee wishes to be an "elite" school, an ambition not altogether consistent with the role suggested by the study. There is, for example, a strong commitment to "remaining strong enough to attract the good student."

The President finds Tuskegee's students "better prepared, more serious, and more socially interested than in the past." A faculty member found, however, that there was a "greater problem in the student body with basic skills now, but also there are more individual students who are very good." All agree that some of the better students have been lost to integrated schools.

Like many schools in the late 60's, Tuskegee sustained a major incident of student protest. The cause of the 1968 protest is not mentioned in the interviews, but the outcome of the incident is described. According to a faculty member, the President "made up his mind to get rid of the radicals, and he did." Nevertheless, another consequence of the incident was that the decision-making process was opened up for the first time to students, which was evidently one of the demands of the protestors. The committees on which students now serve, however, play a minor role in the decision-making process. An overwhelming number of respondents said that the President made the decisions at Tuskegee. "When there are real decisions to be made, the President makes them. He lets us know, in no uncertain terms that 'he is the President.' That's the truth," the business manager explained.

Many of the decisions he has made seem to have been made with Tuskegee's precarious financial situation in mind. In his interview, the President commented little about non-financial issues. Concerning Title III, for example, he felt the funds were "inadequate" with respect to "overhead costs," though he expressed satisfaction with the "general appropriations pattern." He added that there is a need for "greater creativity" in Title III programs at Tuskegee.

It is difficult to understand the latter comment. The many Title III programs at Tuskegee are perhaps most noteworthy for their consistently impressive creative and innovative design.

Perhaps the most creative and most successful program is the oldest program--"the Tuskegee-University of Michigan Cooperative Program." The program began in 1956 under other sponsorship and at that time provided for the exchange of only a few students and faculty between the two schools, chiefly from Tuskegee to Michigan. Last year, by comparison, 99 Tuskegee students went to Michigan to study, and approximately 50 Michigan students went to Tuskegee for the same purpose. Thirty-two faculty members from Michigan visited Tuskegee to teach, conduct seminars, or supervise research; while 21 Tuskegee faculty members went to Michigan (3 to teach, and the other 18 for advanced graduate study).

The Michigan program also includes a "cultural exchange" phase and several other types of resource exchange between the two institutions. The program director remarked that "Research efforts at Tuskegee have been stimulated by our association with Michigan. . . . We also share facilities, including a library catalog comparison, and Tuskegee is a frequent recipient of Michigan book gifts." Michigan experts have also designed a new, innovative, freshman English course for Tuskegee, in association with Tuskegee faculty.

The program seeks to be an equal partnership, but despite the coordinator's claim that "this is not a big brother-little brother program--both institutions receive benefits," it seems obvious that Tuskegee receives the bulk of the benefits. Several respondents stressed that there was "no problem of paternalism" (a main concern for a proud, black college), but a few students expressed contrary sentiments. In a similar vein, the assistant coordinator of Title III felt that the major disadvantage of the cooperative program was that "Michigan takes most of our best faculty. Even though their faculty is very helpful and capable, we need our best faculty at Tuskegee." These two were the only objections voiced; generally the program seems to be very well received and very helpful to Tuskegee. Title III took over sponsorship of the program in 1965.

Many of the other Title III programs at Tuskegee have some ties to the Michigan program. In the area of faculty development, for instance, many of the 45 faculty members released for advanced study thus far have done their studying at Michigan. This faculty development program, which was described several times as the "main emphasis" of

Title III at Tuskegee, has resulted in nine Tuskegee faculty members receiving their doctorates. A peripheral, but significant, consequence has been the hiring of a number of the 38 Nation Teaching Fellows who were originally secured in order to release faculty for graduate study.

The area of curriculum development has also been dealt with creatively in three major programs. The experimental "Freshman Program" has allowed 25 to 50 freshmen annually to participate in a remedial interdisciplinary studies program with much individualized faculty attention. There has been some criticism of this program. "The results of the program did not follow through to the sophomore year," one faculty participant observed, "there is still a great need for a truly effective freshman year program." Many respondents felt that the problems with the program would be corrected with the incorporation of the new English course. The program has been funded 60% by Title III for the last three years.

The "Cooperative Education Program," which is now allowing 150 students to combine their studies with practical experience in industry, was originally a Title III program but has recently been absorbed by the school. It continues to be a very popular and successful program, according to the administration.

The "Social Science Outreach Program" creates opportunities for social science students to work with and observe local social institutions. Though emphasizing the need for even more "program ties with the community," the President nevertheless proudly recounted the many accomplishments of the program in his "Statement of the President" of last year. "Students have worked with community organizations such as

Model Cities, Community Action Neighborhoods, and the City Recreation Department," he wrote. "Some have attempted to initiate a Welfare Rights Organization; others worked in Head Start and served as mediators between groups in the [redacted] County Council on Retardation and Rehabilitation." Furthermore, according to the Title III coordinator, the development of a degree major in social work "grew directly out of Outreach experiences."

Tuskegee also is the "fiscal agent" for the Alabama Center for Higher Education (ACHE), a consortium of eight small Alabama colleges. ACHE is now funded entirely by Title III. It was conceived in 1967 through a Ford Foundation grant. Its most significant purpose outside of administering funds has been the supervision of a program for the collection and evaluation of materials on black Americans. For this purpose, an archivist has been employed by the consortium for the past five years.

These are the major Title III programs effecting Tuskegee. There are a few "minor" programs that should be mentioned. Title III funds have allowed faculty to attend a few regional seminars and workshops. They have financed a rather well received "Visiting Scholars Program" and have aided the institution of the new Development Office by allowing the head of that office to study for a year at Dartmouth College and by providing for helpful consultant services during the planning of the office.

Aside from the previously mentioned requests for more funds to cover overhead costs, travel to professional meetings, and more community work (all of which would certainly be very helpful to the school, if not absolutely essential), there were two other areas which were cited as needing improvement that Title III might be able to offer. One was a "need for more counseling and remedial services for freshmen with poor backgrounds." A non-Title III federal program, "Project PRIDE," has recently been instituted to provide for these needs, but, according to the Title III coordinator, "counseling needs are still fairly great . . . there is some duplication of services, and most of the effective counseling is still done informally by sympathetic faculty."

The other major area of concern was the consortium. The President particularly, but others as well, felt that many more benefits could be derived from ACHE if it was provided with the necessary funding. "We desperately need funds for administrative improvement . . . for joint recruitment efforts, for an improved cooperative approach in the areas of veterinary medicine, community-related, and freshman-related programs," the President said.

With or without these additional funds, the future seems relatively bright for Tuskegee. The school appears to be endowed with a hard-working and innovative administrative corps, a dedicated faculty, a surprisingly aware, ambitious, and "committed" study body, and a long, proud, distinctive tradition. Title III funds have had an effective and crucial impact on the school in terms of improving its services and, consequently, in "raising its horizons." Tuskegee owes a great deal to Title III and seems to be aware of that debt. In turn, it is essential, especially in light of Tuskegee's present financial condition, that Title III continue to aid and encourage Tuskegee in pursuing its goals and commitments in these next few years of continued, and perhaps intensified, "growing pains."

Delaware State College

(Dover, Delaware)

Delaware State College is a state-supported institution of higher education located in the city of Dover, the state capital. It was founded in 1891, following the passage of the second Land Grant Act, as a college to serve the needs of Negroes. However, in recent years it has become a fully integrated institution with a student body composed of approximately 40% white and 60% black students. It was observed that the faculty and the administration are fully integrated.

One of the major changes in the past few years has been the growth of the physical plant. Of the 15 buildings on campus, the four that have been completed since 1967 are:

1. The Martin Luther King Student Activities Center, one of the most recently completed structures on campus. The Student Center reflects a social-academic climate because it not only houses administrative offices associated with student affairs (e.g., placement) but also has a bowling alley and several conference and class rooms.
2. The Medgar Evers Dormitory for Women.
3. The Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources. This Center has contributed to the change in emphasis in agricultural training from vocational training to programs in more specialized areas.

4. The Science Center, constructed at a cost of $1,500,000, which houses an astronomical observatory as well as other modern scientific laboratories.

Two of these buildings, the Martin Luther King Student Activities Center and the Medgar Evers Dormitory for Women, were named for the two black civil rights leaders in 1968 at the demand of the students. At first, the administration and the Board of Directors refused to acknowledge these demands, so the students boycotted classes. At the height of the protest, they took over several of the campus buildings. When the Governor came to the campus to deliver the dedicatory address for the new buildings, he was met by boycotting students, and his speech was interrupted several times by the protestors. As a result of the disturbances, the college was closed for a few weeks.

In an effort to resolve the demands of the students, the Board of Directors approved the naming of the new buildings as requested, and the students agreed to send letters of apology to the Governor. This incident marked the beginning of student involvement in major matters pertaining to the college. Students now serve on major committees, including a faculty-student subcommittee of the Board of Directors, and are regarded as having considerable influence in the governance of the college.

Another major incident, one which received national and international publicity, was the discovery in 1970 that about 15 out of 57 football players were users of hard drugs. The publicity of this incident caused much concern within the state, and a drug abuse program is now required by the State Department. Therefore, a Drug Abuse Education Program was initiated at Delaware State College, and a rehabilitation clinic for students needing help in breaking the drug habit was established. Now a greater sensitivity to health and to psychological problems prevails among administrative and student personnel workers.

Another incident worthy of note is that in 1970 the college received a 55% increase in state funds over and above what it normally receives. This indicates that the college is better off financially than at any other time in the past.

In terms of funds received from Title III through the federal government, the institution was directly granted $127,000 in 1971, a 33% increase over the previous year's monies. A majority of the respondents agreed that the writing clinic was one of the most successful federally funded programs. In the lab, students receive individual help with their writing difficulties. Despite the fact that more staff members are needed and that more students should be involved in the clinic, the program has shown its effect in the increased number of students going to graduate school.

The counseling program, which received Title III support for tutorial services, has been in operation for only a few months, but it already has its problems. The counseling and guidance programs need improvement, and there appears to be a high percentage of personnel turnover, which makes improvement plans difficult to carry out. The placement office, which has received partial support from Title III, has been relatively successful, according to several respondents.

The development office, which has been successful in fund-raising efforts, is considered to be such a valuable aspect of this developing institution that it and the writing clinic are the two offspring of Title III which would be perpetuated even if federal funds were to be terminated. If funds stopped coming, the cultural improvment programs would be curtailed, making it impossible to get guest lecturers. Also, the two-month-old institutional research office, which has made possible the hiring of IBM personnel to develop registration procedures, would have to be dropped. There is presently a master plan which includes a 10-year projective plan, and a biracial study of the 1970 freshman class in comparison to the 1971 freshman class. The director of the office also sees a need to look seriously at the curriculum for "deadwood." There is a need for better planning; therefore there is a need for the institutional research office.

Many of the respondents mentioned an increase in the number and quality (as well as a change in composition) of the faculty. The number of faculty has risen along with the growth of the student body, and both the faculty and student body are fully integrated. There are more faculty members with Ph.D.'s as a result of Title III and NTF's, but one respondent would like to see more black teachers get their terminal degrees.

The last Title III program mentioned was the Summer Science Institute, but no comment was made as to its success or failure.

The Title III monies are allocated on campus on the basis of proposals approved by both the dean and the Title III coordinator. Department heads are informed of the allocations for their area or program, and project directors submit requisitions which are drawn against the budget. Coded ledger cards are used for the internal procedure, and purchase orders are prepared by the business office. These monies are audited by state auditors.

In terms of improvements in the handling of the monies, various respondents suggested multi-year funding which would help in planning programs ahead of time. Also, they would like to carry funds over to the next year (presumably a reference to left-over funds, which are usually returned to USOE). Another respondent voiced the need for more flexibility in handling money, so that removal of restraints on transferring money from one item on the budget to another would be made possible.

Though Delaware State College is not a part of a consortium, it does have a working relationship with the University of Delaware. Faculty members of the "developing" institution were disappointed that the "developed" University was limited in its willingness to help solve problems.

Traditionally, most of the graduates went into teaching after graduation, but with the decreasing need for teachers, many graduates now pursue careers in the business field. Many biology majors were able to find work in research jobs. The students who do go on to graduate school compete easily, but their financial situation is often a major problem.

Delaware State College is definitely a developing institution attempting to bring itself into the mainstream of higher education. It does have the advantage of being a state-supported institution and, as mentioned earlier, they are quite proud that their state financial assistance was increased by 55%. They feel that this indicates the state's interest in developing the school. And by upgrading faculty and administration development, the curriculum, and student services, Delaware State College appears to be putting Title III monies into valuable programs.

Clark College

(Atlanta, Georgia)

Both the President and the Director of Development of Clark College agree that the Title III programs acted as catalytic agents in shaking up the faculty and turning the college around in the direction of a concerted effort to improve the quality and nature of its program throughout its various constituents. Since the coming of the President to the campus roughly coincided with the institution of Title III programs at Clark College, the other important shaping force could well be the new diversified administrative structure, with its overall encouragement of innovation and critical evaluation.

Through Title III funds, Clark College has participated in the Thirteen Colleges Program consortium. As coordinating institution for the Cooperative General Science Project (CGSP), Clark's science faculty developed the program which, because of its success so far, has been adopted by the other consortium members. The institution of the CGSP program, a revised science program for non-science members, has enabled Clark to obtain teaching equipment in connection with CGSP. This has been a great benefit to the college because it allowed the institution to allocate funds toward other essential instructional items in its overall academic program. Teachers receive preparation before joining the CGSP program staff, and textbooks, laboratory manuals, and other teaching materials have been prepared.

The freshman studies program also stems from the consortium arrangements. This remedial program, which aids students in communication and mathematics skills, has been quite successful in bringing the remedial students up to a level at which they are comparable with the other students. The freshman studies program has also had an effect in turning Clark College around and bringing about a great improvement in the caliber of the faculty. Many respondents reported that the program has shaken up the older faculty, making them see the need for change in the curriculum and in methods of instruction.

Another highly praised Title III funded innovation is the new medical technology program under the Allied Health Studies Programs. Many of the students come to Clark to prepare for a career, and the medical technology program (along with other special Title III programs and the fact that this is a co-ed black school) attracts many students.

In summary, the purchasing of equipment, the stature of the college and its science offerings, improvement in caliber of instructional program and personnel, and the impact of science education in general in producing a small rise in the quality of student performance can all be attributed to the specific benefits of being in such a consortium arrangement.

In terms of additional curriculum development, respondents have provided a few suggestions. There is a desire for an extension of the innovative character of programs (such as CGSP and aspects of the freshman studies project) to other elements in the academic program, e.g., social sciences and humanities. Another respondent wanted to develop an interdisciplinary program both for community service and for exploring new career directions, e.g., black studies and urban studies. Although the freshman studies project has been very successful, there was a suggestion that a pre-college or compensatory program be initiated. There are plans to have the academic program become more student-oriented by placing students on the Council of Academic Officers and the Curriculum Task Force (an off-shoot of the Thirteen Colleges Program).

Other improvements of Title III programs include the further development of the placement office. Development was curtailed by the termination of Title monies in this area this year. The counseling program is the least developed of all the college's programs and has no discernable format at present. However, there are plans to give it a structure on the academic level and then to have it dovetail with other counseling services and with the placement program, provided that money is available.

Other possible improvements include more in-service training for administrators involved in decision-making, an improved selection of workshop and institute facilities, funds for research, and more options for unilateral grants.

If Title III monies were terminated, respondents agreed that the cooperation within the Atlanta Complex of Colleges would continue. A case in point is the CGSP program, in which Clark College's initiative in developing the general science program for the colleges in the complex will certainly be supported following the completion of the Title III support. However, at least another year of the federal support is needed in order to complete the biology phase of the program. In 1971, Clark College received $666,000 in Title III monies.

Due to a shift in responsibility for the allocation of funds to the institute itself for special programs under Title III, Clark, the coordinating institute for the CGSP program, receives monies for the program. The college also receives Title III monies as a participating member of the Thirteen College Program. The monies are distributed on campus through the office of the Fiscal Officer for Special Projects, with the specific director of the program serving as the budget officer for that program. The funds are audited on campus.

The atmosphere of Clark College appears to be easy-going. There is socializing among and within members of the faculty and administration. Decision-making is fairly diversified. Students, most of whom find jobs in teaching, industry, or government agencies, and who settle in Atlanta, are not yet part of the Council of Academic Offices, which appears to be run by three influential faculty members. Neither faculty nor students participate on the Administrative Council, but they are involved in other aspects of decision-making.

All of the administrators, and probably all of the faculty, are informed about Title III programs at Clark College. The students were very much award of the Thirteen Colleges Program and the Cooperative General Science Project, but they did not know the programs were funded by Title III. Apparently they became very curious about other projects funded by Title III on campus.

The college has been given a new direction under the President's administration (since 1965). The freshman studies program has improved instruction throughout the college. The level of achievement of the students has risen accordingly, and the faculty have identified themselves more personally with the image of the college. The administration's morale has improved greatly throughout all of its areas of organization, due to the diversification of authority. It is evident that the increased morale of the entire school, as well as the programs of this developing institution, can be attributed to the combined contributions of the President, his administration, and Title III monies.

Morehouse College

(Atlanta, Georgia)

The term "Morehouse Man" has been given new meaning due to the restructuring and new administrative philosophy in the areas of responsibility and innovation throughout the Morehouse College. These changes have enabled the college to meet the challenges of today's students in such a spirit of openness that the high standards for which Morehouse has been known have been maintained. The changes are attributed to the administrative philosophy and style of the President, who is himself a "Morehouse Man." In fact, seven of the eight administrator-respondents are alumni of the college.

The reputation of Morehouse in the black community for its outstanding alumni (for example, Martin Luther King), faculty, and special programs has attracted black male students to this institution. Most students have professions or graduate work as their objectives, and Morehouse meets their needs by providing a high quality education and by giving the graduates a good basis for serving the black community. Sixty percent of the graduates attend professional or graduate school.

All of the respondents highly praised two special programs at Morehouse College which are under Title III sponsorship. They are the Critical Languages Program and the Distinguished Visiting Professors Program. As part of the Atlantic Center complex, Morehouse has made these courses available to the other participating institutions.

Under the Critical Languages Program, the College has been able to offer study in foreign languages that are important in today's world but which require specialists difficult to obtain in a school with the size and resources of Morehouse. The languages involved this academic year are Russian, Kuo, and Swahili. Basic training in linguistics is also provided. Last year Chinese was included in the program. The coordinator of the Critical Language Program stated that the program "generated interest in foreign language study at a time when there is a decline in interest on other campuses."

The Distinguished Visiting Professor Program enabled Morehouse to offer to the Atlanta complex of colleges a very high quality of professors and artists from institutions and positions whose salaries were beyond the reach of the college. This year visiting professors are teaching in the areas of English, economics, and history, while the artist is a distinguished black American composer. The coordinator of this program described the benefits of the visiting professors and artists: "the exposure to these highly skilled and very talented people has lifted the sights of the students. There has been considerable spin-off in spurring other faculty members to excel. It has also increased the interest of students in graduate work."

Another institution, Clark College, has administered a program that Morehouse students participate in, the Cooperative General Science Project (CGSP). The program, according to the President, has "enabled non-science majors to obtain a general education, knowledge, and understanding of the nature and scope of science in today's society. As a spin-off benefit, it freed the specific science departments at Morehouse from having to give this type of course so that complete attention could be given to further upgrading the offerings and teaching in the discipline."

Morehouse College has been the coordinating institution for the Atlanta complex in development. "The Development Office is now independent in operations in that it can help develop programs within the framework of the consortium and its resources rather than being restricted within the limited resources and facilities of the institution. This has enabled Morehouse College to develop in areas where it can be really strong, such as in the sciences, rather than fragment its resources throughout the college," stated the Director of Development.

The 13 Colleges Program and faculty development were mentioned only in passing.

The monies are distributed directly to Morehouse as the coordinator of the two special Title III programs, Critical Languages and Visiting Professors. The school receives an allocation as a participating member of the consortium with Clark and the other center college. The monies on campus are allocated by the Dean of Faculty in all instances except funds for development, and monies for coordinating are audited on campus.

Most administrators and key faculty know about Title III programs. The students are well aware of the Title III elements. Because of this awareness, the nature and value of Title III is seen as an essential part of the college's program.

One respondent thought that semi-annual reports for Title III programs would be an improvement, both in current operating efficiency and in future planning operations, whether they receive Title III help in the future or not. Since Title III has had much to do with increasing cooperation among the Atlanta Center institutions, the member colleges will work together to continue the programs. In fact "the Office of Development has set up a fund-raising procedure for taking up the slack when Title III phases out of the consortium. In this regard the consortium members have been most cooperative," reports the Director of Development. Morehouse has been receiving Title III monies since 1967; it received $279,000 in 1970 and $272,000 in 1971.

Besides the Title III programs and improved administrative quality a three-two program in engineering has been established with Georgia Tech and computer science has become a major. The building program has gone forward, and badly needed land has been acquired for present and future development. The business manager would probably say he could use some of that land. He felt that operations of the college in many areas, including his own, are hampered by the cramped space available. The staff is there (and apparently the space), but the money for such development is the basic need. A teaching materials center also seems to be needed.

One area in which Morehouse is lacking is its counseling program. Academic counseling was described as being too narrow. Remedial programs do not have a separate character at Morehouse, since the college has always been quite selective in its admissions program. Though still selective, Morehouse is endeavoring to reach out to more disadvantaged young men from the inner city who need remedial help. So far, the tutorial efforts of upperclassmen as well as instructors and certain personnel officers have enabled such students to come up to the high standards of the college.

Several administrators see the development of a comprehensive counseling program as a needed change, especially a program that incorporates academic counseling with psychological services and financial aid. Apparently many of the students seek counseling at the financial aid office, which makes every effort possible to help students graduate from Morehouse, as far as finances are concerned.

The only recent major incident mentioned was the 1968 lock-in of the Board of Trustees and President at Morehouse college, which had an ultimate positive effect upon the welfare of the college. Apparently a small minority of the students wanted to get the attention of the Board members. The President recalled that "the vast majority of the students did not support the lock-in and had to be dissuaded from attempting to free the President and the Board members. The students, by and large, rallied to the support of the administration, as did the faculty. As a result, an unusual rapport has been established between the students and faculty and the administration." This seems to be a strange way to get business done, but as one respondent stated, Morehouse is unique.

Morris Brown College (Atlanta, Georgia)

Traditonally, Morris Brown had had a reputation as a college "for the poor who want an education leading to a good job." In the past, that good job was likely to be in teaching; there were few programs outside of teacher preparation. Today, Morris Brown has a business program the equal of its education program, and has opened up vocational training in many other areas as well.

In spite of the curriculum diversification, the school remains rather homogeneous. It is a school for poor, Atlanta-area blacks with strong Methodist church ties. Compulsory class attendance and compulsory chapel were both required until not long ago, when they were repealed in a student referendum. Significantly, nearly all respondents felt these policies should, and would, be reinstated. Often cited was the lost "sense of community" since their repeal. "If the vote was taken now, these decisions would be reversed," one administrator predicted.

While this policy change is primarily suggestive of the role morality and religion play in the life of the school, it is also indicative of the role those outside of the administration play in decision-making. The President remarked that "decision-making is spread around pretty well," and he seems to be right. The faculty has responsibility for development in the area of the curriculum, and students sit on most committees, even the most powerful, the Administrative Council.

The President, however, exerts great influence as a result of his position and his powerful personality. He is exceptionally well regarded by his colleagues and his students alike. "Before the President returned (the president left Morris Brown in 1961 and returned in 1965), the college stood still, now he is moving it forward dynamically," one administrator remarked. The President maintains rapport with the students by visiting their dormitories every weekend and by encouraging them to vist him at home, which they do frequently. He is a very strong moral force on campus, it seems, in the absence of compulsory chapel.

There is some question about how much of Morris Brown's progress should be attributed directly to the President's leadership (according to students, certain plant changes were "brought about to some extent by student protests," and federal aid also began in 1965), but there is no question about whether Morris Brown is moving forward.

"The grounds are no longer littered with trash nor are there student paths through all the hedges, broken windows in the dormitories, or large areas of dirt and mud. Even the old buildings are maintained far better than they used to be, and some have been renovated or razed," one interviewer wrote, in comparing Morris Brown's present physical condition to the way he found it in 1964. Along with the previously mentioned curriculum and decision-making changes, new co-ed dormitories and a new Student Union have improved student morale considerably. Enrollment has increased, the faculty has been "upgraded, and the administration has become less strait-laced." The Title III co-ordinator described the changes in the following way: "In 1965, Morris Brown was a dogmatic undergraduate college with no major change in ten years; it was rigid. Now there is open involvement of the faculty, better benefits, and a statement of rights and privileges. Much of this is a result of a human relations emphasis in ways of working with the faculty."

The faculty may be less happy with the changes than the rest of the college community. Three faculty members saw "higher faculty salaries" as the most important change yet to be made. When asked which segment of the college community cared most for the school, one faculty member responded, "The faculty must care most since their salaries certainly aren't competitive." Another faculty complaint was that "the faculty is left out of decison-making except in curriculum areas . . . students are better represented than the faculty."

Nevertheless, faculty relations with the administration seem to be satisfactory, if rather formal. There is little socializing between the two groups, and the faculty was characterized by the President as "more reserved than the administration." The faculty's competence and concern for teaching are unquestioned. "Most of the faculty enjoy teaching,"one instructor observed.

The students they are teaching may be of a somewhat lower caliber than they have been in the past. Morris Brown is now attracting students from a wider area. They are "more sophisticated," but they are not "of better quality," according to the President. Another administrator, the Director of Cooperative Improvement, explained, "The student body suffered from desegregation. More qualified students began attending integrated schools. Now more 'low level' students attend Morris Brown."

In response to this development, Morris Brown has worked on its remedial program--with apparently uneven success. The program is variously described as "not adequate due to money and staff problems," "excellent in reading, mediocre in math," "weak in student counseling, but strong in academic counseling," and as "effective . . . but insufficient." There is an oft-expressed need to expand and improve certain aspects of both the counseling and remedial programs.

Title III funds have been of great importance to Morris Brown in the area of curriculum development. The funds are responsible for the "outstanding" business program and also the "excellent" food management program. Title III funds "upgraded" a formerly weak business administration department, providing four new faculty slots and several new courses. According to the President, employment opportunities are "getting tight in teaching, but opportunities are good in business." The Director of Development added, "Most graduates go into teaching historically and that is still the largest group, but more now go into business." The improved business program undoubtedly has something to do with that.

The food management major is the only "consensually successful" program started from scratch with Title III funds. A major in food management prepares students to work in hotel and hospital kitchens.

Title III funds were also used to develop an existing, but faltering, "human relations" program. These workshops for faculty, students and administrators, as noted, have led to "open involvement" and "improved faculty benefits."

Other Title III programs were seldom mentioned. There are three others--consultant services in development, National Teaching Fellowships, and a "Cooperative Curriculum Improvement" program. All are relatively new, as such, may have simply been difficult to evaluate.

The consultant services appear to have been useful in a general way. Morris Brown has moved swiftly in the area of development, and part of the credit may be due to the help of consultants.

NTF's were mentioned only once, in passing. The "upgraded" status of the faculty was mentioned several times, however, and the NTF's may have been useful in that respect.

The Cooperative Curriculum Improvement Program has not yet proven its value. According to the Title III coordinator, it is a general development program for the social sciences. There was no substantive achievement noted in any of the interviews, and only the program director (who was described as "bitter and defensive about his program" by one interviewer) called it "successful." A conflicting evaluation was suggested by the President's desire for "more social studies involvement in the community." The interviews, however, did not probe far enough to allow for much more than speculative analysis; the program remains a mystery.

Another mystery is the role of the Clark consortium at Morris Brown. Much dissatisfaction and outright antipathy towards the other consortium schools is apparent in some interviews, while in other interviews (those with key administrators particularly) the consortium is described in such glowing terms that it sounds almost unreal.

The students felt that cooperation in the consortium was at an all-time low and that Morris Brown was "being taken advantage of" by the other consortium schools. The President, while noting that "Morris Brown was at one time low man in the consortium," said that "things have changed . . . . cooperation is improving." He also found real benefits in cooperatively designed programs and "center-wide (or consortium-wide) classes." All respondents felt the consortium should expand its services. "More cooperative buying" and "more cooperative sharing in academic fields" were the suggestions most frequently endorsed.

Most also felt that the only thing holding the consortium together was federal funding. One faculty member colorfully described the prospects for continued cooperation after the completion of the Title III program as "the same as a building has for staying together after an earthquake." An administrator also felt "the consortium would end of necessity if funds were cut." These statements suggest that consortium cooperation is probably minimal at the present.

The most serious problem with the Title III program at Morris Brown is the "loose" handling of the funds. The check from the government comes to the business office and is divided into six pieces, each of which is paid to a Title III program coordinator, who establishes a separate bank account or checkbook. No controls are imposed by the institution on the expenditure of these funds. There has been only a perfunctory audit by the business office for the last five years. The business manager said he is taking steps to insure "tighter administration" in the future.

Those Title III funds used for the expected purposes have helped Morris Brown considerably, particularly in the development of the business and food management curricula. More questions must be asked about the three seemingly less successful programs, including questions about the handling of their Title III appropriations.

Future federal funding might be directed towards strengthening the consortium-wide programming. The President felt, for example, that Morris Brown students should have more access to the strong science department at Morehouse, while Morehouse students, similarly, might benefit from the strong education department at Morris Brown. Another area of possible development is the remedial program, because of its apparent inability to meet present student demands.

Paine College

(Augusta, Georgia)

Starting with an initial Title III direct grant of $63,000 in 1966, Paine College has successfully implemented many programs, especially for the students and the faculty. After working for six consecutive years with Title III funds, the college (at the time of the interview in 1971) was receiving $264,000 which covered two-thirds of its working budget.

Paine College, a black institution, attracts local students, not only because they save money by living at home but also because of the Academic Skills Program, which is funded by Title III monies. Counselors and remedial personnel work together in interviewing and testing students. If assistance in mathematics, reading, or English seems necessary, the students are referred to the Academic Skills Clinic, where the remedial courses succeed in bringing deficient students into full status in the main college program. Both of the interviewers described their visit to the Clinic as "a very rewarding experience personally." Student after student told them how he or she was more encouraged to remain in college after overcoming deficiencies through the work of the Clinic. They felt they could attack their lessons in the regular college program with greater drive.

One of the administrators commented that, because of the new remedial program, a greater number of students with academic deficiencies have been accepted by the college--a factor that has changed the composition of the student body. But there has not been a change in quality, because a great number of these students are being upgraded and put back into the regular classes.

It is evident that the Academic Skills Program is quite successful in meeting its goals and in serving the students; but students, faculty, and administrators insisted that the Clinic was understaffed. Additional full-time counselors would increase the number of students receiving individual attention, assist in the placement of students, follow up on graduates and drop-outs, and do research for an evaluation leading to the improvement of the program. Another suggestion was to have consultants and exchange personnel help bring career placement activities (which have also been funded by Title III) into closer collaboration with the counseling and guidance service. A few of the administrators would like to see a drug abuse program instituted in the counseling services, more staff for a high school equivalency program, and more tape recorders and visual aid equipment.

Title III funds have helped improve library services also, but media equipment and in-service training for librarians were suggested as additonal means of upgrading the library.

NTF's anf the Faculty Development Program were mentioned as being important in the improvement of faculty members by giving them funds with which to study for advanced degrees. The Paine administrative team, being well informed on the operation of the Title III programs, knew who had received grants for study and who had come to the campus as visiting professors or graduate assistants. One of the professors received financial assistance in working toward a Ph.D. degree at the University of Georgia and now carries the work of Academic Dean in marshalling the energy of programs towards improving the academic preparation of the students. Through their responses to questions on the interviews, some of the faculty and students showed their awareness of these Title III programs. Other students did not realize that they were involved in the federally funded programs through the Academic Skills Clinic until the phases of the programs were discussed and clarified.

New courses recently instituted at Paine College include a computer course through the Medical College of Georgia, humanities and art, and physics. Exchange programs have just begun with Tougaloo College, Tuskegee Institute, and Benedict College. But the faculty, staff, and students feel that much improvement could be made in terms of curriculum development. Their suggestions include (1) a cooperative educational program utilizing community agencies and businesses as laboratories, with academic training at the college, (2) undergraduate social work in the social sciences with community involvement, making Paine a "people's college," (3) a black awareness curriculum, (4) improvement of the science, business, and fine arts curricula, and (5) more faculty for general education classes in science and basic English.

Most of the above suggestions were contributed by the new President, an alumnus of Paine College who came to office in July, 1971, as the first black President in the history of the college. His hiring occurred after black students had confronted the administration, asking for a black President. The effect was positive because the students raised the morale of the college under their own leadership. Also, there are more financial contributions from the alumni now,and the morale of the faculty and staff (a great number of whom are alumni) has been raised.

Another recent incident which every interviewee mentioned as having left a mark on the institution was the racial disturbance of 1970. The students protested the slaying of six persons in the Augusta jail and were falsely accused of inciting the riot, when they were only joining other blacks in expressing anger at violence perpetrated against blacks. At first, Paine suffered from having a bad image in the community, but, with a clearer factual appraisal of the situation, the community no longer holds the students responsible for the riot.

The students, many of whom later teach or go to graduate school because business jobs are hard to find, come to Paine College because of its good academic record as a liberal arts school and because they want to advance in social and economic status. The students find the faculty easy to approach and willing to put in extra hours for the students. Faculty and staff are so busy that they have little time for socializing as much as they would like, among themselves and with students.

The students and faculty do work together, for they both make suggestions for curriculum changes to the Chairman of the Division, who, after study and justification of the need for the change, makes recommendations to the Administrative Council. Final approval can be made by the Student-Faculty Senate. This procedure illustrates the attempt being made to make the faculty and students stronger forces in the decision-making process than was previously the case. Committee membership is well distributed; and though the President and Academic Dean exert powerful influences in their ex-officio roles on some of the committees, their power is not as strong as in the past.

The Title III funds, allocated on the campus by requisition from departments approved for the reception of funds and audited by a certified accountant, have definitely contributed toward the enthusiasm of this "developing institution." Paine College appears to be worthy of the help and assistance derived from the federal funds; and, in fact, the upgrading of the faculty, the improvement of the curricular offerings, and the better administration of the remedial services through the counseling and guidance program could not continue without funds presently being supplied by Title III.

South Georgia Junior College
(Douglas, Georgia)

There is much satisfaction at South Georgia Junior College with the "state of the college." New programs and course offerings are being added at a deliberate pace. Instruction has improved in the last few years due to the spread of the "individualized" approach to teaching, which has largely replaced traditional "systematized" approaches. The administration has adopted a "team concept" style which has greatly democratized decision-making. Finally, with the advent of the new remedial program, there is a general belief that the college is better preparing its students for future education and employment.

Located in one of the most rural areas in Georgia, this college has a student body of 1,200 which is composed of poor whites and blacks who would be unable to meet the academic requirements of other area colleges. South Georgia offers these students an education they would otherwise be forced to do without. The education they receive is generally a mixture of liberal arts courses and vocational training, which seems to be quite effective in inspiring students to continue their education. A great majority of students enter four-year colleges after graduating from South Georgia. "Terminal programs"--that is, vocational programs which prepare students to enter occupations upon completion of a two-year course of study--are increasing in number and popularity.

Terminal courses in nursing, industrial technology, and criminal justice have just recently been added to the curriculum. Those 30% who enter the job market immediately after graduation reportedly "have no trouble finding jobs."

The college has been integrated for several years. Approximately 12% of the current student body is black--a figure roughly equivalent to the percentage of blacks in the area. Integration was effected without incident. The administration and faculty of the college are all white, and although relations continue to be positive, black student respondents (and some white student respondents) saw a need for hiring black teachers and for opening a black studies program. Ironically, because the present instructors respond positively to their students, the college has a small turn-over rate, and thus few positions become open that might be filled by black teachers. Every respondent noted that faculty and student contact outside of class and office hours was frequent and profitable.

All respondents also felt that decision-making on campus was democratic. Decision-making is largely decentralized so that the Curriculum Committee, for example, approves all changes in course offerings on the recommendation of the departmental head, who receives suggestions from members of his department. "The team approach to administration insures that there is no one most powerful person on campus and that all groups share in decision-making," one administrator remarked. Some students felt differently. "In theory, students have a voice," one student leader said, "but the President really decides the issues." Contrary to his implication, however, this student ranked the student government as one of the three most powerful forces on campus.

Though the overall tone of the interviews was one of satisfaction, there was an undercurrent of dissatisfaction noted by the interviewers in their narrative of the case study. They found, for example, that "some faculty members appeared to be depressed by the composition of the student body, feeling that cast-offs and students unable to be admitted elsewhere were coming to South Georgia" and that "despite the racial harmony, the student body did not appear to be closely knit." There was also the suggestion that the respondents might have been "rehearsed" for the interviews since the responses were the same, many times to the word, on nearly all questions, and since all respondents, with the exception of the President and a few students, were "tight-lipped" or generally unwilling to divulge any information not specifically requested.

Many times students who have had little success in high school, such as those who attend South Georgia Junior College, will choose to avoid college and further failure, regardless of whether they can get into a college or not. In other words, students do not attend South Georgia simply because they "can't go elsewhere"; the college must attract such students. It is able to do so primarily because of its highly regarded remedial program. This program, which the college calls the "Developmental Program," has been entirely funded by Title III since its inception two years ago. The program seeks to offer comprehensive remedial work and expert counseling for all students "with academic deficiencies." The program is regarded as "by far and away" the most successful Title III program at the college--and sometimes the evaluations are even more favorable. "The Developmental Program is the best part of the college," one student said. "Through it, students get good help in overcoming academic weaknesses." The only criticism of the program was that it "needs additional staff to meet increased student requests."

Another obviously effective Title III program, as measured by the frequency of its mention in the interviews, was the in-service training grant which sent several key administrators to a conference on "Team Concepts in Administration." The college has also received substantial faculty development funds. Six faculty have been released for a full year, and 24 additional faculty were able to take the summer off in order to work on advanced degrees. Five faculty have returned with doctorates. However, three instructors left the faculty of the college for better jobs after receiving these advanced degrees. The National Teaching Fellows who replaced the six faculty on full-year leave were called "outstanding" by the President "for their enrichment of the curriculum and for their innovative ideas."

Presumably of more moderate success were the faculty workshops on "micro-teaching" and the work on "core-curriculum" which were mentioned only as elements of the Title III program and no further. Even less successful were the Title III-funded Development Office (which was not even mentioned in the interviews) and the several visits by consultants (which were characterized as having "very little continuing value").

The college was arbitrarily placed in a consortium group of four Georgia junior colleges by HEW primarily to facilitate funding. From South Georgia's point of view, funding has definitely not been facilitated through this arrangement. Several respondents complained that the college was "left off the funding lists too often." One interviewer explained, "Some dissatisfaction exists about the handling of Title III funds. A major complaint is that Brunswick Junior College, the fiscal agent of the consortium, often provides inadequate response to requests for funds by South Georgia." In other areas as well, cooperation appears to be minimal. Consortium-sponsored programs in the areas of the fine arts and faculty exchange have had uneven success. The several students speaking to the interviewers of the need for a fine arts program, for example, were evidently unaware of the already exisiting consortium program in that field. The only benefit of the consortium which was mentioned was a "useful exchange of ideas." In spite of the complaints and general lack of enthusiasm, all respondents felt that cooperation (such as it is) would continue even if Title III funds were cut off, though "serious cutbacks would have to be made."

It looks as if the "terminal role" of the college will increase in importance in the future. Respondents favored the opening of more terminal programs; the President suggested programs in pollution control and transportation, for example. To complement this new role, the development of job placement services appears to be a high priority of the college. The interviews indicate that administrative interest in such services is strong, but that funds are lacking. The Title III program at South Georgia might be effectively directed towards expanding the "terminal curriculum" This might be done, as was suggested by several respondents, through jointly sponsored consortium offerings. The Title III program might also be directed towards the development of job placement services. Possibly the requests of the black students for black teachers and a black studies program could also be met. At the same time, the "increasing student requests" for remedial work should not be neglected. It is principally in this area that Title III has had a substantive impact on the school. Continued funds for the in-service training of faculty and administrators are also recommended since they have been generally effective in the past.

Clinton (Iowa) Community College

Clinton Community College has a long way to swim before it reaches the "mainstream." The school lost much community support in 1967 when it applied for North Central accreditation and was refused. This was a heavy blow to Clinton, which exists primarily to serve its immediate community. Enrollment dropped for three to four years after the incident, and the school is still suffering for it. Many respondents judged new programs according to the response they elicited from the community. For example, one instructor commented, "The establishment of the new Nursing Program made the community feel that the college was sensitive to its immediate needs and was putting forward an effort to help.

Clinton does seem to be trying to help. New community-oriented programs have been developed in adult education, secretarial skills, and, as noted, in the field of nursing. The changes, according to one interviewer, can be attributed to an awareness of student and community needs and an effort to provide for those needs.

Other problem areas appear to be improving more slowly than the curriculum, when they can be said to be improving at all. Morale is only "so-so." One veteran instructor noted that the faculty had gone without raises for three consecutive years. No doubt this is part of the morale problem. The faculty and administration seem to trust each other very little. In describing the decision-making process at Clinton, the librarian said, "Faculty-student committees make recommendations to the Dean, who consults with his cronies before making a decision on recommendation to the Superintendent." (The school is a part of a community college district with the central, or supervising, office in Davenport. Title III funds, for instance, are handled through the Central Office.) Another responding faculty member was more direct in her appraisal of the administration. "They should seek and hire qualified administrative personnel," she said, "rather than appoint former high school teachers to upper echelon administrative positions."

In the course of the interviews and evaluations, the administration emerges as a powerful but poorly organized, complacent, and largely ineffectual group. The staff and the faculty can make contact with the Central Office only through the mediation of the Dean of the College, who was characterized by one interviewer as "not aggressive in decision-making." It is unclear from the interviews why the transfer from community control to central control occurred (the only proposed reason was that "the community lost interest"), but all agree that the change-over had great impact in bureaucratizing administration of the school, and in making it less accessible to other segments of the college community.

No students were interviewed. Their faculty and administrators say they come to Clinton because it is inexpensive, near home and work, and not as threatening as a four-year college. Only 10% matriculate to four-year institutions; the rest, as one administrator put it, "get married or get a job." Clinton students are vocationally oriented, and the faculty and administration seem proud of the job Clinton does in preparing its students for obtaining jobs. "None of our students have any trouble getting jobs," one teacher observed.

Clinton is currently developing a program for the recruitment of rural, low-income students from the area; the success of which, they say, will require additional remedial and vocational education facilities. Many Clinton students are already from rural, low-income backgrounds, and compensatory remedial programs are of considerable benefit to such students.

For the last four years, Title III has funded a guided studies program which has fulfilled the remedial needs of Clinton students--at least some of those needs. Guided Studies were described by the Dean of the College as "a comprehensive remedial program for the marginal student." Many of those interviewed felt the Guided Studies program was "very effective"; others were less satisfied. The remedial program was just as frequently described as "fair," and those closer to the program seemed to favor the latter evaluation. The need for "more materials and instructional media" was frequently cited as a problem, but the program evidently suffers most from "poor counseling services." The need for a full-time counselor in Guided Studies was expressed in four separate interviews. The present counselors evidently cooperate with the program, but their services are generally described as of undistinguished quality and spread too thinly to be effective.

Title III has also funded travel for key personnel to attend workshops and to visit institutions where Guided Studies programs were in operation. The opportunities for travel were appreciated, but few considered the benefits substantial enough to merit mention.

Clinton is a member of a consortium of four eastern Iowa community colleges, a fact which only a few administrators seemed to know. Although they generally felt the college benefitted from its participation in the consortium, they had little idea of what specifically the consortium had done for Clinton. One specific benefit mentioned was the "ironing out of most of the curricular difficulties that had been plaguing our transfer students." Another was the coordination it was planning to offer for identifying and recruiting rural and low-income students.

Title III programs were highly visible on the campus. According to the interviewers' reports, the funds constitute "a very essential part of the overall institutional program." Guided Studies were often mentioned as having an "impact" on the institution. Students who receive this assistance, one instructor said, "usually fit in quite well with other students and have very few adjustment problems." The program will be of continuing importance as Clinton begins recruiting more "rural, low-income students."

Though the funds have apparently been helpful, there is some evidence, as noted, that more funds to provide for (1) a counselor for the program, (2) additional instructional materials, and (3) an expanded "basic" curriculum are needed to make the program truly effective. Some of the inadequacies may be attributable to poor administration of past funds, and also to "intra-institutional politics."

It is likely that programs aimed at improving Clinton's "community image," such as improvement in vocational education and technical courses, might be as essential to Clinton as the presently funded program, since Clinton's most important concern as a developing institution is a fundamental one--the development of community support.

Eastern Iowa Community College

(Muscatine, Iowa)

Muscatine College is one of the campuses of the Eastern Iowa Community College. It serves students within a 40-50 mile radius. Traditionally this institution has functioned as an experimental station for those students who want to obtain a four-year degree but who are not sure they can succeed in such an academic environment. About 40% to 45% of the graduates do transfer to four-year colleges.

A large percentage of the transfer students would have found jobs in the business field or joined the armed forces after their two years at Muscatine, but the institutional improvements at the college have helped prepare more students to continue their education. At least three factors in the improvement of the community college can be attributed to Title III programs. First, the Student Services Center was mentioned by most of the respondents as being the most significant new program implemented recently. Through personal counseling, along with some educational counseling, an effort has been made to reach borderline students and to urge them to become more involved in campus activities. Closely related to the Student Services Center is the developing remedial program which was noted as being very good in English, science, and math.

A second big step forward for Muscatine was the faculty development programs which were made available through the consortium cooperation. Members of the faculty participated in workshops and conferences by traveling to other schools to inspect and observe good programs in action. The opportunity to travel to other schools resulted in better faculty attitudes with more self-confidence and greater respect for their individual jobs. The faculty saw and realized that all schools have problems similar to theirs and that they are still capable of doing representative jobs. This travel has improved instruction, and the teachers' motivation and enthusiasm has been passed on to the students.

The third noteworthy Title III contribution is also related to the consortium arrangement. The consortium provided workshops and meetings for the community college with four-year colleges involved. As a result, they were able to iron out, to a great extent, many of the previously existing transfer problems. The easy transfer to four-year colleges is a major reason why students are attracted to Muscatine.

All six teachers who were interviewed have participated in workshops or conferences, and all knew that these programs were related to Title III. But it is interesting that five of the six participants admitted knowing very little, if anything at all, about the consortium arrangement. The sixth member knew that at one time the consortium had existed, and noted that consultants visited the campus, but he added that his knowledge of its activities are limited now.

Two of the three administrators interviewed seemed to know a little more about the consortium. The Director of Instruction and the Registrar attributed the development of a product called "software," which is used for individualized instruction, and the development of minicourses, to the consortium.

Other changes were also listed as proof of Muscatine College's development. These include an enlarged and improved physical facility and an expansion of the library in space and number of volumes. An administrative change took place at the superintendent level two years ago. The overall attitude changed from completely dictatorial to one which granted more campus autonomy. One respondent remarked that the change resulted in a rise in faculty morale, greater faculty and student involvement in decision-making, and increased faculty dedication. Another change in the school curriculum is an example of Muscatine College's attempt to meet and provide for community needs. Agricultural programs which include farm management and agricultural marketing courses have been established. The implementation of these programs may draw the community into a closer relationship with the college.

It was the opinion of most of the respondents that the counseling service is weak and inadequate. The major complaint was that it needs more staff members because the current staff is bogged down with duties that do not involve actual counseling. There seems to be an overlap between the role of the counseling service and the Student Services Center, which is funded by Title III. Perhaps a consultant is needed to straighten out the confusion.

The need for more career programs (e.g., nursing and medical technology) was mentioned quite often. Apparently the college is interested in attracting more students, for there was a request to step up the recruiting program to reach more adults (for the new adult education program) and more high school students. One respondent wanted more NTF's to allow time for faculty to develop content material for individualized instruction. (This was the only time NTF's were mentioned in any of the interviews.) And, in general, everyone wanted to continue and improve the existing programs of the student services center and faculty travel.

According to the two interviewers, administration of Title III funds, of which $113,000 were granted in 1971, is controlled through the central administrative office located in Davenport. If the funds were to be terminated, one administrator thought that the Title III programs would continue to operate but on a much smaller scale. But a 19-year veteran faculty member was more pessimistic, and perhaps more realistic, when he expressed his doubt. The expenses must then be borne, he explained, by an institution that already has an inadequate budget.

The rise in faculty, administration, and student morale can be justly attributed to Title III. One faculty member remarked that his colleagues are no longer "willing to sit still." Another respondent felt that they "have now moved to a point of no return," so that the effects of the federal monies have definitely spurred Muscatine College on to become a developing institution.

Benedictine College
(Atchison, Kansas)

On July 1, 1971, St. Benedict's College, a small, parochial college for men, and Mount St. Scholastica College, a small, parochial college for women, merged under the name of Benedictine College. Benedictine College is still small, and remains a two-campus college, but both campuses are coeducational and "because people have been shaken out of their old ways, the new school is potentially more innovative and is becoming more socially aware."

The merger drained the schools of much energy and a large part of their financial resources. As a result, the greater potential of the new school remains largely untapped. "There is a great need for setting our goals," one veteran faculty member remarked. "The biggest block to this is the energy expended on debt reduction of money borrowed to effect the merger." Several other respondents also noted that the school was not yet "over the merger hump."

The President of the school and the board of trustees have evidently been reluctant to "jeopardize the merger" by decentralizing decision-making. According to one faculty respondent, "The President is ruling strongly at this point. Decision-making just hasn't shaken down yet from merger efforts." A faculty leader was somewhat more critical of this new style of administration. "The faculty is frustrated by its lack of power," she said. "The board of trustees set restraints on curriculum change as a condition of the merger, and the faculty doesn't trust the board."

The merger was not effected without a cost in other areas as well. Several instructors lost their jobs as departments consolidated and were forced to eliminate duplicate positions from their budgets. Faculty insecurity was often mentioned as a continuing problem. The closeness of the faculty to the students was consistently cited as "one of our strong points," but with the merger "student-faculty socializing greatly decreased due to the necessity of moving the faculty out of the dorms to make room for the new students," according to one administrator. Also, the plans for the merger took precedence over smaller plans which had to be "pushed aside" for the time. The college community shows some impatience over not being able yet to re-involve themselves with these plans. "People have set aside some important values to accomplish the merger," one faculty member said. "There will be frustration until these become important again."

When the school does get "over the merger hump," it should settle down into a slightly looser style than that which marked either of the two original colleges. Those schools traditionally provided a modest academic challenge and a strong protective service for rural white students from the surrounding northeastern Kansas area. Many students are the children of alumni. Some students are attracted by the smallness of the school and the close faculty-student relations. The basketball program is a very cohesive force on campus since nearly the entire campus community follows the team. Approximately 30% of the graduates matriculate into graduate professional schools. One-fifth go into teaching, and the remaining graduates choose business careers.

The style of the new school should be more relaxed, and less protective, primarily because of the declining impact of the religious order and the predictable consequences of coeducation. Lay persons have just recently been added to the faculty, a development which most respondents regarded as an improvement. One administrator felt that, as the college loosens up, it would at the same time begin to "take itself more seriously as an academic institution." A doubling of size would be enough to compel the school to take itself more seriously, but the greater vitality of a happier, coeducational student body should also contribute towards encouraging this attitude.

The "4-1-4" academic year structure was recently adopted, and it has allowed the school to experiment with new approaches to learning. One administrator's belief that "the college must relate itself more clearly to the rural poverty question" is evidence of the school's emerging social awareness. This statement certainly would never have been made during either of the original schools' more sheltered and reclusive pasts.

The merger is, in part, attributable to Title III. Title III funds were earmarked for consolidating services and for institutional exchanges which precipitated the merger. Auxiliary services, such as counseling and library services, were consolidated first through Title III. Title

III also provided for faculty and student exchanges and for a busing system that provided an important transportation link between the two schools.

According to one administrator, these programs "reduced competition between the two colleges and gave us the impetus to merge." Another administrator felt that the merger would have taken place anyway, but much more slowly. Apparently the major purpose of the original Title III program at the two schools was to speed up the merger, a course of action which had evidently already been decided upon, at least as an informal goal. Title III, for instance, provided consultant assistance from the beginning to help in planning the merger.

Aspects of the Title III program not directly related to the merger were the faculty improvement program, which sent 18 faculty members back to school to work on advanced degrees, and the development of a new counseling center. Through faculty development grants, four faculty members were able to receive doctorates, two were able to receive M.A.'s, and five finished all the course work for doctorates.

The counseling center first emphasized psychiatric counseling but has since turned to an emphasis on educational and vocational counseling. Both interviewers found that the counseling services "could use further improvement," but neither gave even a hint as to why they felt the services could use improving. One respondent thought that counseling was becoming a problem "due to the extending of the campus," but other respondents either expressed satisfaction with the counseling services or did not comment on them.

Since the merger, Benedictine has used Title III funds to work on curriculum development, particularly on the use of instructional media. None of the respondents offered an evaluation of the new program emphasis. Undoubtedly, any evaluation would have been premature at the time.

Benedictine is a member of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE). KCRCHE is a strong and dynamic consortium, but Benedictine's involvement has been minimal. The school has participated in the cooperative social work program, the cooperative urban teacher program, the telelecture series, and interlibrary loans, and has also received computer assistance. The computer assistance was called "very disappointing" by one respondent, though, again, no details were offered or elicited. The two other assessments of consortium-sponsored activities were just as sketchy. One faculty member felt that the "exchange of ideas" which the consortium provided was "helpful," and another felt the college needed "more involvement" in the consortium. Benedictine's relatively great distance from Kansas City may be an obstacle to this involvement.

Kansas City, Kansas, Community Junior College

KCKCJC, as the college is often referred to in Kansas City, is in the midst of two important transitions--(1) from a preparatory school for the upper division of public four-year institutions in Kansas to a school offering a large vocational-technical terminal program as well as transfer courses, and (2) from an institution oblivious to the community around it to a school with strong ties to and support in the community. Any statement made about this campus should, therefore, be qualified by making it clear that the statement is only valid for the time when this case study was written--May, 1971.

Up until 1965, KCKCJC shared its small campus with a high school and was under the jurisdiction of the Kansas City, Kansas, School Board. In 1965, the college gained its independence and was given its own school district (with the power to levy taxes) and its own Board of Trustees. This change did not lead to an immediate change in the college's orientation; vocational-technical programs and community service programs (such as credit and non-credit part-time courses for adults) were introduced only very gradually. The college's greatest achievement so far has been the passing of a bond issue to finance a new campus in the Kansas City suburbs which will accommodate 5,000 full-time students in 1980 and will make possible a considerable expansion of vocational-technical and community service programs. The move to the new campus will take place next year. At the present time, the college is housed in several buildings in different parts of downtown Kansas City; there is no campus proper. The administration building (which also houses the general-use classrooms) is a rather dilapidated former school building on the edge of a black slum area. It is noteworthy that the administration has taken steps to insure that the present set of buildings will continue to function as KCKCJC's downtown center once the new campus has been established. This effort reflects the school's desire to serve the less mobile students from the black ghetto areas, who are not likely to have means of transportation to reach the new campus.

Almost all of the 1,200 full-time students at KCKCJC live in Kansas City. A large proportion of students study full-time and hold a part-time job as well. The proportion of black students--about 20 percent of the college's full-time enrollment--is quite small, considering the school's proximity to a black ghetto. However, the proportion of black students is considerably larger in the college's community programs, which incorporate both credit and non-credit courses. Students come from a wide variety of socio-economic and educational backgrounds, and the range of ability levels is quite striking. While KCKCJC is not, strictly speaking, an open-enrollment college, it nevertheless accepts a large number of students who are in need of extensive remedial instruction. (The school recently introduced the peer-tutoring approach to remedial instruction and seems to have obtained encouraging results.) On the other hand, some high-ability students who would have no difficulty entering a prestigious university seem to prefer KCKCJC. The wide range in academic performance among students has been one of the characteristics of KCKCJC for many years.

KCKCJC is a true "street-car" college which provides neither housing nor even food service for its students. While the college's administration would like to get students interested in such "collegiate" activities as working on the official student newspaper and school sports, interest in these activities among students is very low, a fact which everybody on campus attributes to the students' lack of time due to their part-time jobs.

There is a certain amount of tension between black and white students, but most of the black students' dissatisfaction seems to be directed at the administration, which many black students regard as unresponsive to their needs. The two strongly anti-administration groups are the Black Student Union and a predominantly black group which publishes Truth, one of the two underground newspapers on campus. There have been a few confrontations between black students and the administrtation during the academic year 1970-71, but neither the students nor the administrators involved in these incidents feel vindictive.

Most faculty are dedicated teachers who generally agree that the school should switch from the still predominantly academic program to a predominantly vocational-technical program and should become more responsive to the needs of the community. There is very little student-faculty interaction outside the institutional context; neither faculty nor students have time for social activities. Most faculty are looking forward to moving to the new campus, but quite a few feel that the move will be an anti-climax because of the long period of anticipation since the project of building a new campus was first announced. Faculty-administration relationships are quite strained because there is little opportunity for faculty to participate in governance (as an example, some faculty complained that they were never consulted regarding their needs when the plans for the new campus were drawn up).

Faculty complaints about authoritarian decision-making at KCKCJC are probably justified. The President and the Dean of Instruction make all major decisions, the existence of an Academic Policy Committee notwithstanding. The Dean of Instruction is a dynamic former faculty member who is pushing hard for changes in various areas and who is unhappy over faculty resistance to many of these changes. He professed having switched sides, i.e., having exchanged his faculty position for an administrative one, in order to "get things done." The Dean is in continuous contact with (and fighting against) the faculty, whereas the President--who makes the most important decisions on campus--remains aloof.

KCKCJC is connected with Title III in two ways, as a member of KCRCHE (the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education) and as a participating institution in the Program With Developing Institutions (PWDI) coordinated by the American Association of Junior Colleges. The school's affiliation with KCRCHE has been somewhat less than a full success for the obvious reason that the Council's programs are primarily aimed at the private four-year liberal arts colleges which constitute the bulk of its membership. However, the fact that KCKCJC is still a member of the Council, despite the relatively high annual membership fee of $4,000, indicates that the benefits the college derives from its membership in KCRCHE must be worth at least that amount.

As a participating institution in PWDI, the college has been able to send a large proportion of its faculty to various kinds of regional workshops. Quite a few faculty and administrators feel that Title III has had a very strong impact on their school through these workshops. As a result of these workshops, a number of curriculum areas--especially in the natural sciences--have been thoroughly revised. Faculty in the natural sciences are now developing their own audio-visual materials and texts for their courses and seem to feel that these materials represent an important improvement over commercially available materials. Both faculty and administrators feel that in the future many more faculty in other academic subjects should be given an opportunity to attend workshops. While it is unlikely that all of the faculty will attend workshops (attendance is, of course, voluntary, and a number of older faculty members strongly object to having to re-examine their approach to teaching), the administration hopes to encourage many more faculty in the humanities to attend workshops so as to provide an impetus for a revision of the humanities curriculum.

It would seem that Title III funds should also be used to reorganize the administrative structure, which is at present too unresponsive to student and faculty demands. KCKCJC's administrative structure is too undifferentiated; there is no delegation of authority, which rests with the President and the Dean. KCKCJC's size and the complexity of its programs clearly require a larger number of administrators in order to relieve both President and Dean from having to spend their time on many trivial and routine matters when they should be devoting more of it to important matters.

Alice Lloyd College

(Pippa Passes, Kentucky)

The integrating force at Alice Lloyd College is the Appalachian environment within which the college is located. Alice Lloyd is very much committed to the way of life in the region and to the improvement of the quality of Appalachian life through the examination of the region's history and culture.

The college selects and recruits for admittance primarily Appalachian students from families with incomes of less than $3,500 per year. Many of its students are the first in their family to finish high school. The college has been able to help "deserving students" through its financial assistance program. Most students at Alice Lloyd receive some financial assistance from the college. A remarkable number of these students--from 90% to 95%--go on to four-year colleges after completing two years at Alice Lloyd. The school is intellectually oriented, rather than vocationally. The curriculum (which is based on "student life needs") reflects this orientation. The "student life needs" curriculum was not fully described in the course of the interviews, but it appears to be directly related to Appalachian culture and the culture's relationship to the outside society. The college has established courses of study in Appalachian sociology, Appalachian music and crafts, regional Indian history, Appalachian literature, and the future of Appalachia. An integral part of the "student life needs" curriculum is the "Outreach Program," which allows students to study and work for neighboring community institutions.

In order to optimize the benefits of the "student life needs" curriculum a flexible calendar, allowing for both work and study, was adopted three years ago. Since that time instructional methods have become more individualized and student-centered. In addition, the remedial and counseling programs have been expanded and improved. The Special Services for the Disadvantaged Program annually provides 50 selected students with counseling and tutorial assistance. Reading and "study skills" work is available to other students upon request. Many respondents felt that those students who could best benefit from such assistance were usually the most reluctant to ask for it; some felt that the school should employ a full-time reading specialist so that these students could be recruited for reading classes. Another important change that is peripherally related to the development of this new curricular approach was the relaxation of the dress code. This action was undertaken in spite of considerable alumni and community criticism so that, according to one administrator, "students might be more autonomous and responsible to themselves."

This greater student responsibility has not apparently damaged the traditional community closeness on campus. One administrator explained, "As a small, isolated institution, the social interaction outside the classrooms and offices is a very important positive feature at Alice Lloyd. The college takes on an extended family atmosphere." Towards this end, all meals are "family-style" with administrators, faculty, and students involved; and there is a very informal and ubiquitous pattern of off-campus socializing between all groups. Decision-making is not quite as evenly shared as socializing. The primary decision-makers are the President and two other administrators. According to the President, students and faculty do not seem to be particulary interested in decision-making. "We have wide participation," he added, "but there are certain areas where decisions must be made by specified personnel."

In general, morale appears to be very high at Alice Lloyd. Students have responded positively to their greater freedom by participating actively in classroom and "outreach" activities. One instructor noted, "Students seem much happier now that conduct regulation is more liberal and sensible." Faculty likewise are in good spirits. They have recently received a pay increase, and many of them have been able to return to school for advanced graduate study during the last four years. In addition, the "student life needs approach" has apparently allowed teachers to approach their teaching more creatively by providing "greater choices and options in teaching."

Faculty development grants from Title III have allowed 17 faculty members--nearly half the entire faculty--to continue their graduate study. Two faculty members have received their doctorates, and several are reportedly close to receiving advanced degrees. In addition, many of the National Teaching Fellows originally employed to replace faculty on study leave have been hired by the college to fill permanent positions. Faculty development grants are only one aspect of the diverse Title III programs at Alice Lloyd. In the area of faculty development, the school has also been able to hire three professors emeriti, all of whom have evidently made considerable contributions to the quality of teaching at the college. Several administrators emphasized the assistance these men gave to Alice Lloyd's young faculty in their "professional maturation."

Administrative development at Alice Lloyd has also been covered by Title III. One administrator was released for further study in higher education; several consultants have visited the college to confer with administrators (primarily about curriculum planning); and funds have also been provided for annual attendance at a University of Kentucky workshop for cooperating institutions.

The emphasis of the Title III program at Alice Lloyd has gradually shifted from faculty and administration development to curriculum study. Title III made a major contribution to the development of the "student life needs"curriculum by making it possible to conduct an institutional study, the feedback from which helped guide administrative efforts in reshaping the curriculum. Of even greater importance to the respondents was the Learning Resources Center, which most respondents described as the most successful Title III program at Alice Lloyd. The Learning Resources Center coordinates with all aspects of the basic curriculum in stimulating independent learning. Title III funds were used to acquire equipment for the Center and for instructing faculty and students in its creative use. A year later, funds were used in a similar way to develop a Language Arts and Skills Laboratory, which was the precursor of the previously mentioned--and extremely successful--Special Services (Remedial) Program for the Disadvantaged.

Until the end of last year, Alice Lloyd was a participant in the now defunct Lees Junior College Consortium, which comprised five junior colleges in Kentucky. The major program of the consortium was the development of "model programs" which could later be shared by all. Alice Lloyd, for example, chose to concentrate on the development of a curriculum based on student life needs. Of the other models, the college benefited most from the "Cooperative Education" model of Lees Junior College and the "Learning Resources" model of Henderson Junior College, according to several respondents. In addition, the college shared a film loop catalog and a record catalog with Henderson.

The President explained, in rather vague terms, that the consortium disbanded "because of differences in the institutions that became apparent during the cooperation and because of certain logistical problems." Alice Lloyd and Lees College will continue to cooperate in future projects, on the basis of their common interest in cooperative education and student life needs.

Presently, Alice Lloyd is involved in the development of the very promising "Appalachian Learning Laboratory," which is its most recent Title III project. This program would take the "student life needs" approach a step or two further by "providing a total educational experience that best corresponds to the totality of life needs and that enables students to realize their capacities as persons who have a leadership impact on the lives of others." The new program would affect the entire college and would entail "a redefinition of the role of the teacher, the development of a wide range of materials; the addition of new classes on Appalachian culture, politics, economics, and history; student exchanges; and more faculty development." One faculty member observed, "This program could do more than anything else towards providing a more enriched educational experience for Appalachian students and towards training future Appalachian leaders."

According to one interviewer, Alice Lloyd has prepared more than its share of state and regional leaders. The college takes great pride in its leadership role in Appalachia. A loss of Title III funds would adversely affect the traditional role and the projected program of the institution. Title III funds amount to approximately 7% of the college's annual operating income. This is a considerable sum in itself, but, most importantly, it is the major source available to the school for the development of improved approaches to education. Improving its approaches to education is of vital importance to Alice Lloyd since its institutional goals are very much defined by the needs of the region. Title III is perhaps the major force allowing the college to develop methods of better meeting those needs and thus of assuming a continued leadership role in Appalachia.

Henderson Community College

(Henderson, Kentucky)

Because of its small size (enrollment 600) and limited staff and budget, Henderson Community College must operate on a level far more modest than most "developing institutions." Until two years ago, for example, the college had no counselors. What is worse, until that time two "incredibly overworked" men ran the entire administration. There are now four administrators.

In Kentucky, the public community colleges are a part of the University of Kentucky, and this fact, as one interviewer put it, "hampers the community colleges in many ways." Though this type of organization permits easy transfer of credits, it discourages the overall growth of the community colleges. Several respondents felt that Henderson suffered from not having a self-image apart from its role as a feeder into the University and that it was therefore less able to meet community needs. Policy decisions are made at the University level, and this, too, works against the creation of feelings of attachment and pride in the college. The "Director"of the college is entirely subordinate to the "Dean of Community Colleges" at the University and is responsible only for purely administrative decisions. Recently, some efforts to decentralize decision-making have been made. A "faculty senate" has been organized, and the role of the divisional chairman in decision-making has been increasing. Although students are provided for in the committee structure, they generally do not participate.

Although a few two-year technical programs have been developed, the college has served primarily as a transfer agency to the University; 70% of Henderson's graduates transfer there. The clientele has been essentially the same academically as that which attends the University. They attend Henderson instead because of lack of money and, in some cases, because of a desire to stay close to home. In the face of these student financial problems, it is a paradox that financial aid is tied up in the University's financial aids office. There is a general agreement that the college does not receive a fair share of financial aid for its students. Some respondents characterized Henderson as a "step-child" of the University. In short, as one interviewer said, "the institution is limited in its ability to meet the needs of students who come and even more limited in its ability to meet the needs of students who should be given the opportunity to come."

Another major problem at Henderson is establishing the kind of institutional loyalty that is found at independent colleges. There has been a rather high turnover rate in the faculty, and because Henderson is a commuters' school, students do not tend to identify particularly strongly with the campus. The efforts that are being made to improve this situation are modest, but somewhat effective. Athletic intramurals have become important (especially to the faculty) for socializing, and, according to one respondent, "the establishment of faculty lounges in the new buildings has precipitated the beginnings of faculty fellowship." The turnover rate has just recently begun to subside somewhat.

Five years ago, enrollment was half of what it is now. As enrollment has grown, so have the staff and the physical plant. The opening of the Student Union was most influential, according to several respondents, in raising student morale. Small efforts in curriculum reform, highlighted by the recently successful innovations in the English program, have also been made. The college has also initiated a few adult general education courses to help improve community relations.

Probably the major trend in the curriculum at Henderson is an increasing emphasis on technical programs and on "reaching low-income students." Previously, Henderson has served a middle and lower-middle class clientele; now there is a greater articulation with community high schools concerning the needs of low-income students and a greater involvement in recruiting those students. The most popular two-year programs are the oldest ones, those in nursing and secretarial work. Recently the "communications" and "medical lab"programs have been attracting greater numbers of students. There is much talk of developing a new two-year program in social work now, and others later, as funds and staff permit.

"The real benefit of the Title III program at Henderson has been in staffing; the National Teaching Fellows and the student activities coordinator have made the biggest difference," one administrator said. If this is true, and it appears that it is substantially true, it is in spite of the fact that most Title III funds at Henderson have been directed elsewhere. The development of a Learning Resources Center (LRC) has been the major emphasis of the Title III program at Henderson. This development has included the acquisition of machines and materials for instructional media and the education of the faculty in class use of the resources. Lately, Henderson has been developing its own materials rather than buying "packaged materials which might not apply." The success of the Learning Resources Center was duly noted by the President and by the LRC director, but even these respondents seemed to regard the staffing additions as of more overall importance to the college. In addition, there was one unsubstantiated complaint that funds for the Learning Resources Center "were not used properly."

Though two of the Title III positions only lasted for a year, understaffing is such a chronic problem at Henderson that even this temporary relief was greatly appreciated. The college has had two National Teaching Fellows--one each in developmental reading and geology--and both were hired on a permanent basis after their fellowships expired. Additional faculty development occurred through travel and attendance at professional meetings. One administrator noted, "We have had some kickback from faculty who did not want to participate in such things as demonstration class sessions where they really had to look at themselves and what they were doing." Nevertheless, since, as another administrator put it, "the faculty tends to be very traditional, this emphasis on faculty development has been crucial."

The other personnel addition was the hiring of a "student activities coordinator." He said that his job was "to provide social aspects for students to round out the curriculum." This person also handles other administrative chores when necessary, and respondents expressed a high degree of satisfaction with his work and enthusiasm.

Henderson seems to have been rather badly mismatched with the other four schools comprising the now defunct Kentucky Junior College Consortium. It was the only public school participating, and it was separated geographically from the other four colleges. Some opinions of the consortium were more cynical than others. The President said, "I think our consortium efforts have been reasonably successful in providing a good channel of communications from which we have received valuable insights into problems, activities, and successes of other institutions." On the other hand, the business manager felt that the consortium had benefitted Henderson only as a means of getting funded. He also criticized Lees Junior College, the fiscal agent of the consortium, for not assuming an adequate leadership role and suggested that other schools in the consortium might have been guilty of mishandling funds.

In theory, the guiding plan adopted by the consortium sounds very promising. In 1966, each school selected a specific area of concern for which they would be responsible. They were responsible for developing a "model program" in that area and for developing methods of sharing their approach and research with the other participating colleges. Henderson chose to concentrate on developing a "learning resources model." There was a Learning Resources Committee of the consortium which met regularly and attempted not only to share the Henderson approach but also to improve on it. The committee was chaired by the LRC director at Henderson.

Of the other "models," Alice Lloyd College's "student life needs curriculum" inspired the hiring of the student activities coordinator.

The college also used some of the ideas of the "high school articulation model" developed by St. Catherine's Junior College.

Reportedly, the consortium was disbanded on December 31, 1971. At the time of the interviews (October, 1971), the Director felt that "although local concerns are paramount to consortium concerns, cooperation should continue." The consortium was of limited success to Henderson. The necessary rapport for effective cooperation was evidently slow to develop because of great differences between Henderson and the other participating institutions.

With the college's increasing emphasis on reaching low-income students, a natural direction for future Title III funds at Henderson would be in the development of the college's counseling and remedial services. The need for such development is especially critical since these services are now clearly inadequate according to most respondents. There is presently one full-time counselor who is aided by two part-time counselors. "Our intentions are great, but because of our limited staff we don't do enough," the full-time counselor conceded. Title III, through the teaching fellow in reading and through the Learning Resources Center, has already made the major contribution to Henderson's remedial program, but that program is still insufficient. Some other remedial programs aside from the successful developmental reading program have been tried and discontinued because they were ineffective. According to respondents, there is a growing need for additional remedial services. This is a need that Title III might meet. In other cases, it appears that Henderson's problems are still so basic that, as in the past, additional personnel will make the biggest difference.

Lees Junior College

(Jackson, Kentucky)

"We are fashioning our own ideal here at Lees," one faculty respondent said when asked if the college had any models to follow in development. Lees College is engaged in an effort to provide higher education based on the very special life needs of Appalachian youth. An effort to find funding for the kind of curriculum planning which would serve this purpose led Lees to submit a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). NEH selected Lees last year as a recipient of a full grant for curriculum development. Lees was the only junior college selected and one of only six colleges in the country that were selected. The desire for a curriculum which relates better to the needs of Appalachian youth grew out of a faculty meeting two and a half years ago in which there was heated exchange between faculty members over the use of the classic curriculum focus. A committee was appointed to begin to develop a new focus on the curriculum. Students, faculty, and administrators all participated in planning the NEH proposal. Once completed, the "Appalachian life curriculum" will be available to other colleges in the area.

Lees has traditionally helped prepare Appalachian youth for senior college. This function has not changed markedly. There has been some increase in the offering of terminal or two-year courses in such areas as health, social and community service, and television-related fields. Ninety percent of Lees students do transfer. However, nearly as many return to their homes after completing college. Thus, there is a definite need for an Applachian life needs curriculum. For the increasing number of students who are pursuing terminal programs, the need is just that much greater. As one faculty member put it, "An attitude of deep concern for students has developed within the last few years. This may have been caused by employment of many new, young, dedicated faculty members. There has been little change in the quality of students, but a positive change in the quality of the faculty and administration."

Most students attend Lees becuase it is close to home and becuase there is financial aid available to those who need it. Lees administrators also actively recruit in local high schools stressing the attractive programming at Lees. Though enrollment at the college has increased somewhat in the last few years, the relatively small size of the college remains one of its most attractive recruiting points. Because of the small size, there is much informal socializing on and off campus between students and staff. Also because of its small size, there is the opportunity for more personalized instructional methods to develop. Several recent incidents, including the planning of the NEH proposal, have increased morale at the college. Faculty salaries have been improved so that they are now somewhat more competitive. It is a testimonial to the traditionally high morale at the college that even when faculty salaries were very low, faculty turnover was still very slight. Students have succeeded during the last year in changing the previously restrictive dormitory hours and in changing chapel attendance to a non-compulsory status. These successes seem to have convinced students that the administration is concerned about their needs. All members of the college community evidently have access to the decision-making process. Student services have recently been improved in another area as well. With the addition of a tutorial service, many poor academic students at Lees have achieved an academic background competitive with that of their peers.

Though the institution is interested directly in Appalachian life needs, there seems also to be a concerted effort at Lees to broaden the scope of experience of these Appalachian youth, most of whom have had very similar life experiences. This opportunity is provided chiefly by the college's "Cooperative Education," program which is directed towards experiences outside of the Appalachian community. The scope of the program is difficult to ascertain from the interviews. Two of the students interviewed, however, reported that they had been able to spend a summer in working with retarded children through the program. Title III is responsible for such cooperative educational experiences. The model for the program was developed through the Kentucky Junior College consortium. Lees served as the coordinating member of the consortium from 1969, when it began, to the end of last year, when it was disbanded.

Before the consortium was begun, Lees received Title III funds on a direct grant basis. The college used these funds principally in the areas of faculty and administration development. Faculty development was effected exclusively through the National Teaching Fellows program, which provided released time to regular faculty for advanced graduate study. Administrative improvements were made through the use of educational consultants paid by Title III. It is difficult to say how worthwhile these consultants might have been, since no specific changes that theseconsultants suggested were cited by respondents. The college also received a Title III planning grant in 1965, which administrators used to fund a comprehensive institutional self-study.

Shortly after forming the consortium, the five participating colleges adopted a guiding plan under which each college was expected to develop a "model" program for one are of general concern and then to share that "model" with the other colleges. Lees chose to concentrate on cooperative education. As noted, the cooperative education program at Lees has succeeded in meeting a need for exposure for some students.

The consortium disbanded because of the great differences in geographical distance and educational philosophy of the various schools. These prevented the consortium from ever creating a strong commitiment to cooperation. Of the other "models," Lees benefitted most greatly from Alice Lloyd Junior College's "student life needs curriculum." How many of the ideas for Lees' NEH proposal came from the Alice Lloyd model is not known, but, interestingly enough, Lees respondents said that the college intended to continue cooperative activities with Alice Lloyd in the areas of student life needs and cooperative education. It is possible that Lees will share part of its NEH grant with Alice Lloyd, since the amount of work Alice Lloyd College has done on curricular matters in relation to Appalachian life needs is quite impressive (see report on Alice Lloyd College). Because of the NEH grant, it is likely that the cooperative education program at Lees will be modified so that off-campus educational experiences will be certered on Appalachian institutions rather than on institutions outside of Applachia.

Aside from the obvious benefits of the student life needs and cooperative educational models, respondents noted that Lees, through participation in the consortium, also benefitted from the increased availability of learning resources, the inter-library loan program, and from interacting with their colleagues at the other colleges.

St. Catherine College

(St. Catherine, Kentucky)

St. Catherine College, located in an isolated, rural area of Kentucky, has traditionally served as a Catholic college for women. Until last year it was a high school and college, but the high school program (which was not an organizational part of the college but was located on the same campus) has been phased out. Today, the institution has an open enrollment with a student body of 150, which is integrated with regard to religious background, race, and sex. It is now a small community college serving the needs of an economically and socially deprived area. Title III did not cause these changes, but it has helped the college to perform this transition.

The main reason why students come to St. Catherine College is that they can get part-time jobs, live at home, and also get an education in a small college atmosphere. About 80% of the students come to this school to prepare for the basic requirements necessary to transfer to a four-year college. A large number of these students are not academically prepared for senior colleges when they leave high school. At St. Catherine College, individualized instruction is stressed, and a high school equivalency program is offered for those who need it. At this time the religious aspect of attracting students is diminishing in significance.

St. Catherine College, along with four other institutions in the area, is a member of the Kentucky Junior College Consortium. Prior to its Title III aid, the college saw itself as an isolated and disadvantaged school. After three years in this cooperative arrangement, the administration has noticed tremendous overall improvement due to the opportunity for contact with other schools. The consortium arrangement has meant finding resources at other institutions and through consultants, introducing the faculty to new methods and innovations, and a general exposure to "what's going on." One administrator mentioned that presidents of the other institutions had broadened her knowledge of what is available. She and her colleagues had met only a few people outside of the institution prior to their involvement with the consortium. Before, they would not have thought of spending a day at another campus because they would have thought they did not have the time. Now they go and investigate, and as a consequence they can make more intelligent decisions and more effective plans.

Each of the five institutions in the consortium took one section of emphasis. St. Catherine College was the lead institution in Admissions-Recruitment Techniques and Articulation, with high schools as well as with senior colleges. Because of this program, the college has been able to expand the local Catholic atmosphere and control into a more representative community institution. Members of St. Catherine have now taken leadership roles in community affairs.

The majority of respondents agreed that the Media Program was one of the most successful programs. The Media Center, also called the Learning Resources Center, has shown more tangible results than programs in other areas. All freshmen must go to the Center, which emphasizes programmed education and individualized instruction. The students, most of whom are academically and economically disadvantaged, realize that it is for enrichment and not just a remedial center for "dumb-dumb students." The staff foresees a great future for new approaches and techniques in media. One administrator commented on the new emphasis in the curriculum. He said it represents a de-emphasis of the traditional Catholic stress on religion and shows that the institution is more on the "real world" scene now.

The success of the Media Program will affect curriculum development, an area with much room for improvement. Presently the curriculum is set up to ensure easy transfers to senior colleges for the students, because most of them expect to transfer. However, there are also many students who can not afford to transfer; therefore more terminal programs are needed. One administrator mentioned the need to equip the Learning Resource Center for the instruction of grade school teachers, paraprofessionals, and teacher aides in order to provide personnel who are urgently needed in that area of Kentucky. She would like to see the Center expanded to serve more people.

Title III funds have given St. Catherine College the opportunity to send one half of its faculty to other Kentucky colleges for visits and workshops. Consultants have also come to the campus. Also, one half of the administrators have attended national meetings. One faculty member commented that she would like to see the consortium continue to have workshops and sharing of information because of the need to continue to change faculty attitudes.

St. Catherine College receives quarterly checks from the fiscal agent of the consortium, Lees Junior College. The money is kept in a separate bank account and in separate books. The President or Academic Dean files requisitions for expenses, such as travel. These expenses are within the budget planned by the Dean and President in agreement with the other consortium members. There is very little shuffling of the money once the budget has been made. In fact, in some areas shuffling is not allowed. The Title III funds are audited yearly by the regular college auditor, who comes from a commercial firm in Louisville.

Many of the respondents felt that through the consortium cooperation, the participating institutions have formed closer bonds than ever before and that these friendships would continue if Title III funds were terminated. On the other hand, since finance is a major motivation, they may find that they do not have the time for cooperation if there is no strong motivation. With an economic squeeze on the institution, the tuition is not sufficient to run the college. A loss of Title III funds would affect the institution in many vital areas: it would not be able to keep its Admissions Officer; the effectiveness of the Media Center would be minimized; curriculum development would be reduced; travel opportunities for faculty members would be eliminated; and there would be a reduction in the leadership offered to the community.

Academic counseling is supervised by the Academic Dean, with the help of faculty members who want to volunteer their time and services to the students. At one time, all of the faculty members were advisers, but some of them did not want to cooperate. The Dean of Student Affairs is essentially the chief counselor (personal counselor). Counseling is considered good by some respondents, whereas others feel that a male counselor is needed. The nuns tend to overdo counseling by pampering the students.

In the past three years there has been a considerable change in faculty attitudes. The previous administration was dictatorial and did not leave much room for creativity. In the new administration, the faculty has been aware of their freedom to change. The President lives with the other nuns and, therefore, has a close relationship with the faculty. Within the structure of the school's governance, she tried to spread the decision-making among the faculty members, student committees, and the administrative board.

Because most of the faculty are members of the religious community who receive no direct pay, but who can choose where they want to serve, they are deeply loyal to the college and its purposes. Also, the chairman of the Alumni Committee was quite pleased with the response of the alumni and the students. The students attend lectures and off-campus activities with faculty members and know that they are available to them. The students' main complaint about the college is the lack of social life; they need more recreational activities. Because the students all come from the rural, isolated area surrounding the college, they are all very much alike; there are no discernable subcultures. One of the respondents felt that the school needed a broader cross-section of students, including foreign and out-of-state students. The local students need exposure to different life styles.

The administrators of St. Catherine have demonstrated their desire to encourage the students to find out who they are in relationship to society. The President wants a more integrated curriculum with an emphasis on community needs and a sense of mission. (She was not thinking in terms of a religious mission but of some larger goals in relation to ecology and the quality of human life.) She would also like an integrated curriculum revolving around that type of goal to be the central focus of the institution.

St. Catherine is undergoing a radical change from a very protective, highly religiously-centered institution to more of an open-door community college. One of the interviewers felt that the college is not really adequately prepared for this type of change and that considerable work with faculty attitudes, curriculum, and learning theory must still be done. Without funds from Title III, St. Catherine would not be able to move forward in this direction.

ST. MARY'S DOMINICAN COLLEGE

(New Orleans, Louisiana)

The ambiguity present in the data which the interviewers developed at St. Mary's Dominican is relatively high. A large number of respondents did not know much about Title III, and therefore their answers were vague and often incomplete. However, some background was provided in a "college special report" designed to inform members of the college of the institution's involvement in the New Orleans Consortium. This report proved to be quite helpful in providing information about St. Mary's Dominican and its involvement with Title III.

Dominican College has been a member of the New Orleans Consortium with Loyola and Xavier colleges since 1967. Respondents from Dominican stated that they have come to know and appreciate other colleges through working with them through the exchange programs. Certain departments have consortium-wide departmental meetings, including faculty members from each of the member institutions, with some regularity. The consortium hopes to involve even more departments in order to provide for integrated course offerings, more joint faculty teaching, and faculty and student club activities. Present full-time students may cross-register among the three member institutions for as many as six semester units with no additional tuition cost. The consortium was responsible for extending one of the bus lines so that it was easier for the students to get from campus to campus.

In terms of direct faculty involvement, NTF's were mentioned by many respondents on campus, but there was little information as to how the National Teaching Fellows were used. A teacher development program now in progress at St. Mary's consists mainly of student evaluation questionnaires. A copy of the results goes to each dean, so that the department chairman can them distribute them to the faculty of that department. It was not clear how much weight would be given to these questionnaire responses in the evaluation of faculty members for promotion and tenure, nor was it clear how this data would be used in the improvement of teaching.

The consortium members have a joint social welfare major in which students must attend classes on all three campuses in order to obtain their degrees. By combining their resources in this way, the schools can provide a greater variety of courses and majors for their students. The consortium has also allowed St. Mary's Dominican to develop a mental health clinic which offers the students personal and vocational counseling. One respondent commented that, for the size of the college, the counseling program was very good. However, the only remedial programs at the institution are the remedial English and the Evelyn Woods reading programs, which in the minds of many respondents was not a sufficient effort in this area. There was a widely held feeling that the college should have its own programs in remediation. Although the Title III grants cover the full-time and part-time salaries of counselors, psychologists, and psychiatrists, administrators do have to get involved in counseling. One staff member thought this was not a good idea.

Those few members of St. Mary's Dominican College who are acquainted with the program seem to be very pleased with the effects of the consortium. Future plans exist to expand the joint programs, and a multiple-listing catalog of the library holdings of the three institutions is now near completion. Departments in each school will have a complete list of all the material available in each subject area, and hopefully duplication can be reduced in book purchasing in this way. There are also plans for a joint food service, a cultural program, a bookstore, and a degree in art therapy to be patterned after the social welfare degree. These programs seemed quite exciting and were a source of much discussion among the relatively few respondents who were familiar with them.

Traditionally St. Mary's Dominican has enrolled white middle and upper-class Catholic girls from Louisiana in a curriculum oriented completely towards liberal arts and graduate school. The school now enrolls black students and in fact would like to see more minority students apply. The consortium has a major role to play in helping the students develop an awareness of other ethnic groups, in that Xavier is predominantly black and St. Mary's is predominantly white. St. Mary's Dominican College is much less of a "convent school" today than it was in years past, and changes in the church and in the appointment of an all-lay board of trustees have brought changes in the policies of the school. The girls, most of whom teach, get married, or go into allied health fields after graduation, have succeeded in liberalizing curfew and dress code rules. However, they should have more self-government in the residence halls, according to many of the students interviewed.

Certain respondents wanted to bring this institution "up to date" by hiring more liberal faculty who will develop new teaching innovations and who will be more politically and socially representative of the mainstream of American academic thought. Other respondents want to drop tenure, reduce requirements, and bring about a much more flexible curriculum. Given these different agendas for change, the institution could well be in a situation of uncertainty of goals in the next few years, and communication problems with faculty and students may be quite severe for the administration.

The president of the institution has worked very hard on St. Mary's major development effort, concentrating on the expansion of physical facilities. There has been a new building constructed every year for the past five years, and several old buildings have been torn down. The president seems to be growth-oriented and would like to increase the present student-to-faculty ratio of 11:1 to 20:1. He seems quite dedicated to developing St. Mary's Dominican to its highest potential in terms of size and academic quality. The respondents were not able to clarify whether the president's definition of quality squared with that of the faculty; however, there is some evidence for faculty-administration collaborative endeavor in the form of the St. Mary's Dominican College Ten Year Self-Study. Out of this came a great deal of curricular revision and serious thought about the college. A long-range planning council was established in addition to two sub-committees, one to review the core curriculum and the other to study the majors as offered by departments. Partly as a consequence of this ten-year self-study, the Southern Association approved the institution for re-accreditation.

In terms of finances, Title III money is sent to Xavier College for the total amount of the expenses of the consortium and then distributed from there to the other two colleges. The money used to be sent in a lump sum each semester, but now it is sent quarterly with the one exception of the counseling program in which the bills are reimbursed as they are submitted. No auditing of the funds would be possible at St. Mary's Dominican because they are held at Xavier.

In the minds of many respondents, Title III was essential in order to keep the inter-campus cooperation going by way of the consortium of institutions. However, it is certainly possible that a voluntary donation from each campus could provide enough operating money to run the consortium if Title III were to phase out of involvement with it. Several respondents raised the possibility that having only a small number of people involved in consortium activity might actually be deterimental to the possibility of getting meaningful change on the campus as a whole; and indeed that did seem to be one of the problems of St. Mary's Dominican. On the other hand, the consortium is providing the institution with a number of opportunities that were not previously available, and it may now be up to the college to match the dynamism and excitement that the consortium provides with its own program vitality.

Xavier University

(New Orleans, Louisiana)

The President of Xavier University stated that the Title III funds have "greatly helped the college to do what it wanted rather than to do what others wanted. Despite being poor, the college gained respect for being able to decide its own future."

Xavier, along with Loyola University and St. Mary's Dominican College, is part of the New Orleans Consortium. Brought together by Title III funding, these three Catholic colleges emphasized their collective needs in the early stages of their cooperative arrangement. Now they put much more emphasis on the needs of the individual colleges. Through the years, they have become more sophisticated in assessing their needs and establishing programs which fulfill these needs.

Curriculum development has occurred successfully through the College Education Achievement Program. This is an extra-year "tune-up" program for students who are not usually admissible to college. With special assistance however, most of these students can succeed and become contributing members of the college. Xavier will fund the program as much as possible by itself now that CEAP is being phased out. Because joint classes with consortium members are now available, the students have a much wider selection of classes to choose from. New majors have also been initiated.

Included in the folder of interviews was a program of the complete series of management workshops, clinics, and conferences on "The

Organization and Operation of a Small Business." The New Orleans Consortium, along with The Small Business Administration of New Orleans, sponsored this two-semester program, which was offered from August 1971 to May 1972 on the Xavier campus. Anyone having a genuine interest in small business was invited to attend,-and it was possible for students to receive credit if they met the academic requirements of their respective schools. The dean of Xavier noted that the business administration department has grown rapidly in the last ten years and has been catering to the career needs of many students.

In 1967, Xavier and 27 other colleges began a project to help black graduates find employment. Title III supplied this Career Planning Program with funds for the staff, staff training, evaluations, and professional meetings. Since then, career planning has been added to the placement office, which is doing a great deal of business. Until last year, Xavier was able to boast of 100% placement for graduates, a considerable achievement.

Through the health program of the counseling center, started in 1970, the consortium members share staff and testing materials. Referral services are not highly regarded by respondents. The director of the counseling services is considering the possibility of using graduate students on the staff.

The Moton Development Project was responsible for the creation of the development office, but Title III paid for additional staff members, including an alumni director, a public information director, and a secretary. Also, Title III funded a successful fund-raising drive involving Xavier in cooperation with Dillard in New Orleans.

The consortium has also sponsored professional meetings and seminars to help strengthen the faculty. Graduate study has also contributed to faculty development.

Xavier University administers the funds for the consortium. All Title III funds come directly to the business office and are distributed upon receipt of authorized invoices within the budget guidelines. The funds are audited with the regular college audit. No account switching is possible without an approval from Washington.

When the respondents were asked to comment on the future of the consortium if Title III funds were terminated, all sensed the need for the continuation of the consortium relationship. They felt that their involvement in the consortium is so deep that their survival depends upon it. In other words, a loss of funds would mean that the programs would have to be terminated.

One of the major changes at Xavier is the new governance arrangement. The Board of Trustees, which formerly consisted exclusively of members of the religious sect, now has been expanded to include those outside the religious order. A small Ford Foundation grant helped finance the 18-month study of the governance patterns of the college which was completed in 1970. The Board realized a need to expand the size of the board, and now six nuns and six non-church related persons occupy seats on the Board. One respondent wanted to expand the Board even more, up to 27 members, by adding 15 new seats.

The president of Xavier was the first black person, the first male, and the first lay Catholic to become president when he took office three years ago. The office of dean of the school, one of the most influential of the administration, is held by a nun.

In 1968-1969, student demonstrations gave the students a chance to be heard. Because the administration listened, students now have a voice on all major committees. Some respondents say faculty members do not want student participation, while others say the students are more involved than faculty members. The administration seems to make most of the decisions, but with increased consultation.

The composition of faculty has changed during the 46-year history of Xavier. During the first 15 years, 75% of the faculty were white nuns. Presently the figure has dropped to 20% because of a strong effort to recruit and develop black faculty. However, one respondent stated, the competition for permanent places is very keen. Those retained are mostly Xavier graduates. One respondent noted that there is a circle of nuns, a circle of white faculty, and a circle of black faculty, each of which keeps pretty much to itself.

Formerly, the student body had more Creole students because of strong family traditions and ties. Now there is a broader representation from not only the New Orleans community but also from the southern states as well. The student body has a white enrollment of about 10%. Several students came to Xavier because they thought it was a black college, only to find out, to their disappointment, that it had a black majority with a white minority.

Xavier is an instance of a college that would sink if not supported by Title III funds. The desired independence and entrepreneurial spirit has not developed to the fullest at the College. Perhaps the consortium can assist Xavier in this crucial task.

Copiah-Lincoln Junior College

(Wesson, Mississippi)

There is a strong emphasis on what the President calls "the 'we' philosophy" at Copiah-Lincoln Junior College. It is the vehicle through which, as he explains, "we all feel a part of everything that goes on at the school." This emphasis on building solidarity between all levels of the campus community has had many interesting consequences. Several respondents, for example, felt that through this philosophy they had learned that "you don't help students by flunking them or by giving them bad grades." There is a gradual disappearance of the "F" grade at Copiah-Lincoln. Though decision-making is made through a "socialized line of command" few respondents would admit to having any power; the concept of power is not entirely consistent with the "we philosophy." Decision-makers insisted that decisions are made "for everyone's benefit." On the surface it seems surprising that socializing between faculty members is regulated, but it definitely is. "Some courtships have been known to exist, but these are discouraged," one administrator reported. However, this too is consistent with the "we philosophy." According to the President, "Special relationships can be inimical to a solid group." This reasoning may explain also why there is little socializing between faculty and students or administrators and students at Copiah-Lincoln. In any case, the "we philosophy" has succeeded in raising morale at the college to a remarkable level. One interviewer reported, for example, that "this school has the highest morale of any school I've seen."

Superlatives are certainly in order also in describing the physical plant at Copiah-Lincoln. Since the arrival of the new President four years ago, $3,670,000 has been spent in expanding the plant. One interviewer felt that some of the additions--such as the nine-hole golf course, the air conditioning installed in the dorms, and the two new stadiums--reveal a "somewhat odd set of priorities, especially since the new library and Fine Arts buildings await additional funding before construction begins." In any case, the physical plant is becoming a major factor in attracting students to Copiah-Lincoln.

Students at Copiah-Lincoln may be divided into two groups. Approximately 60% of the students transfer to a four-year college. The remaining 40% are terminal students who are involved in the vocational and technical programs. For the latter group, which is apparently increasing in number, programs in practical nursing, cosmetology, "heavy equipment," air conditioning and refrigeration, and electronic instrumentation have recently been added to the curriculum. For both groups, but especially for the academic group, remedial classes in core subjects have been developed. Students generally come to the college because it is near home, inexpensive, and is known to provide much individual attention and financial assistance. In addition, the college operates a bus service which allows students to live at home without problems they would otherwise have in commuting.

Copiah-Lincoln enjoys a very high level of community support. Many of the residents of the surrounding community are Copiah-Lincoln alumni, as are nearly all staff at the college, and this no doubt helps. In addition, the college offers many adult education classes and welcomes community groups in to use its facilities. This community support, which the President has actively cultivated, has worked out well for Copiah-Lincoln graduates. The job demand for graduates annually exceeds the number graduating. Public relations have also worked out well in other areas. The school's budget, for example, has doubled over the past four years.

Aside from wishing to have more of what the college already has in impressive supply (public support, buildings, enrollment, and quality teaching), administrators desire improvement in only one area--counselling. There is a widespread belief that the counseling office is under staffed and, as a result, somewhat ineffective. There is also a feeling that departmental advisors should be added to the counseling organization to formally handle academic matters.

The Title III program at Copiah-Lincoln is used primarily in an "add-on" capacity. Title III funds are added to other funds to finance programs. The proportion of Title III funding in each specific program was not disclosed in the interviews. The remedial programs at the college, however, are evidently funded almost entirely with Title III funds. Students with low reading ability are now required to take at least one semester of developmental reading. One student spoke for the other student respondents as well when he said, "The reading program has improved my reading ability a great deal. I can now read faster and understand more, and my grades are better."

Similar feelings were expressed about the other non-compulsory remedial programs. Special classes in math, science, English, and social studies offer remedial instruction with individualized guidance and counseling. These sections are not required, but students who are weak in these subjects are encouraged to take them. Due to the "helpful attitude" of the teachers, according to the President, students do not resent such suggestions, and are, in fact, anxious to take the classes because "they know the classes will help them get a job or get them into a four-year school." Attendance in the English section is "weak," but the other sections are reportedly well attended. "Remedial programs help bring students into the mainstream of the student body," one administrator concluded. The only complaints concerning the remedial program was that the programs lacked "essential equipment," especially micro-readers.

The other major Title III contribution presently is in the area of faculty development. Two complementary programs are involved. "PWDI teacher assistance" has enabled several faculty members released from teaching duties by Title III National Teaching Fellowships to pursue graduate degrees. Several respondents noted that teachers who could not afford to return to school were able to do so solely because of this assistance. The program was labelled "a great success," and more than one respondent noted a special improvement in the science faculty as a result of this program. Funds were recently reduced for the PWDI assistance program, and, consequently, the school has been forced to cut travel funds and to reduce tuition assistance to cover only one and a half semesters where it once covered both semesters.

Copiah-Lincoln is a member of a consortium of seven Mississippi junior colleges. The principal activity of this group has been to hold monthly meetings in different academic areas, to which five people from each participating institution are sent. The meetings are held at the school which is judged to have the most strength in the specific area under discussion, and that school is responsible for organizing the meeting. At the time of the interviews, Copiah-Lincoln was preparing to host a meeting on the science curriculum. Reports are unanimous in their praise for this program. "A great deal of enthusiasm has been whipped up," one administrator said. "Teachers have been inspired by the kinds of things brought out in these meetings. Teachers readily consent to attend these meetings, even during out-of-school hours, and, of course, students are the real beneficiaries of these kinds of things." In the meetings, the participating faculty members "get acquainted with modern techniques and trends, and exchange knowledge and ideas," according to one past participant. Consultants are often used in these sessions, where they "can offer expertise otherwise unavailable." The consortium is now also at work on a uniform numbering system for courses, possibly in preparation for a student exchange program.

Despite the praise, there was some evidence in the interviews that satisfaction with the consortium was decreasing. When asked what new activities the consortium should undertake, one administrator confided, "What we really need is a rededication of interest in the consortium." Two other respondents would like to see Title III funds come directly to the college rather than continuing to be administered through the consortium. These respondents felt that the present procedure was "often unfair to Copiah-Lincoln." In addition, few respondents felt cooperation would continue if funds were cut off.

Some Title III money is evidently also used in the very successful work-study program at Copiah-Lincoln, and, according to a counselor, some is also used in recruiting and counseling area high school students, in his words, "to explain our program and Title III programs to them." No other respondent mentioned Title III involvement in this project. If Title III funds are used for this purpose, the practice seems objectionable, especially given the "inadequate" counseling services which Copiah-Lincoln students themselves receive. Their needs presumably should take precedence over the needs of area high school students, at least as far as Title III is concerned. Copiah-Lincoln has an effective public relations program and it should be able to find another way to get its recruiting message across, and Title III funds should be turned towards improving counseling services at the college itself.

East Central Junior College

(Decatur, Mississippi)

East Central Junior College is located in Deactur, Mississippi, and serves the surrounding five-county area. It is a unique area, according to many respondents. "We are the most rural and the poorest of all," said one. The school has traditionally provided for a rural white and Choctaw Indian clientele with a relatively inexpensive two-year transfer and terminal program. This clientele changed somewhat in 1970 when blacks were first admitted. Integration reportedly occurred without incident. According to a counselor, the black students "very easily became members of the East Central family."

This family analogy, is a good one for many reasons. The administration, for instance, has a rather paternalistic character. Most respondents felt that "decisions are made at the top"--most of them at the very top by the President. Perhaps as a wry commentary on this procedure, one faculty respondent named the President's wife as one of the three most powerful people on campus. Students and faculty vote on all committees, but the administration is under no obligation to act on committee suggestion and frequently does not. Students were not involved in decision-making until last year when the accrediting team that visited East Central "suggested rather strongly" that students be allowed to participate.

Both interviewers described the East Central family as being "protective" of its students. Respondents frequently report that students attend East Central because of its "homelike atmosphere." The analogy should not be carried too far, chiefly because East Central is less self-contained than it once was, and, consequently, is becoming directly responsive to the outside community.

One respondent reported great community pride in the new vocational-technical complex, which is accessible to the community through adult educational and vocational classes. The last four years have seen great expansion of the physical plant at East Central. A Fine Arts building was completed in 1968, the same year the vocational complex was built. Two years later a new gym was completed, and new residence halls will be opening this year.

The only other frequently mentioned major change at East Central during the last six years was the appointment, in 1966, of the current President. One faculty member explained, "His predecessor was dictatorial and made no bones about it. The current President is definitely more democratic, and this has improved faculty morale." This improvement in morale is reflected by the more frequent faculty-administration socializing since the new President took office and the nearly unanimous response that "all segments" of the college community "care about the school."

Curiously, little is said about the students at East Central. Respondents reported that students either transferred or secured jobs after graduating, that they sometimes "lack school pride," and that they attend the school principally because it is inexpensive and because it is near home. No more personal picture of the student body emerges. This gives some credence to one interviewer's belief that many faculty members seem far more interested in personal advancement than in teaching and institutional development.

The major vehicle for faculty development at East Central is Title III. Most faculty respondents felt that the advanced study provided through Title III was the most successful Title III program at East Central. "Instruction has improved as a result of faculty upgrading. Teachers were exposed to new materials and methods while studying. The resulting versatility made the offering of new courses possible, thereby enriching the curriculum," one faculty member remarked. The new courses specifically mentioned as having been added to the curriculum were several "much needed" adult education and vocational courses.

Consortium conferences and the institution of remedial English and math programs were Title III programs that were nearly as well received. East Central belongs to a consortium group of four junior colleges in eastern Mississippi. The periodic conferences which the consortium organizes for administrators and faculty to disseminate "ideas, methods, and equipment" were described by those involved as "extremely beneficial." Those not involved in the conferences, however, were unfamiliar with any conference-inspired changes instituted at East Central.

Also in consortia, East Central has participated in two sophomore courses with the University of Mississippi--one in engineering and one in pharmacy. The university provided special staff and equipment to teach interested junior college students in these subjects . Students with credit from these classes could transfer to universities in the state with full credit in their field for junior standing.

The school has also arranged with Jackson State an agreement for use of their computer facilities. The facilities at Jackson State will provide East Central with services by means of courses, special courses (with special teaching staff), and possibly by helping to ease administration. Funds for these services are being provided by Title III.

The remedial programs are difficult to appraise because of the small sample of respondents. One instructor felt both programs were "good." The only other respondent to discuss the programs, a math instructor, characterized the English course as "very good," but felt that the math course was "not meeting the needs of the entering freshmen."

Cultural programs have been an important part of the Title III programs at East Central, but they have been severely limited recently by inadequate funding. The entire speech and theater program was previously underwritten by Title III. It has now been absorbed into the regular college budget. The cultural program still purchases season tickets to the Little Theater in a neighboring city for student attendance, but funds for other cultural events have been cut.

There are two other Title III programs in operation at the school. One, the use of audio-visual materials in instruction, was acknowledged by two respondents and not mentioned thereafter in any interview. East Central also has an academic counselor whose salary is paid by Title III. Though no respondent recognized the counselor's connection with Title III, there were a few criticisms made of the counseling program. Two respondents felt that the counseling program could use additional staff. Another respondent suggested that the academic counselor be "relocated." "Presently students seeking his assistance," he observed, "must wait in a place where they can be seen by the Dean of Students [who evidently inspires fear in the students]; consequently some are hesitant to seek assistance."

Title III funds are administered by the guidelines. It is one interviewer's contention that without Title III funds "faculty upgrading would immediately be discontinued . . . and the remedial program would probably be lessened in scope." The school received $58,000 in fiscal year 1967 from Title III and $75,000 each in fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Considering these relatively small amounts, Title III has apparently been quite successful in helping to build a more diversified program at East Central, though further assistance to student remedial and counseling services is probably advisable, and the curriculum, no doubt, could stand further "enrichment."

Meridian Junior College

(Meridian, Mississippi)

Reorganization and expansion are underway on the campus of Meridian Junior College. Since the University of Mississippi has established a residence center on campus, students can stay longer at Meridian than is usual at a junior college and can complete all the requirements for a B.S. degree. Meridian, once a high school, has an enrollment that has increased from 500 to 4,200, including adult basic education. One of the administrators would like to see the program serve more adults in the community, which would mean changes in the student services.

In 1964 Meridian became racially integrated because of the closing of a neighboring black institution, Harris Junior College, by court order. Those students then came to Meridian. Title III monies were instrumental in bringing in consultants who played a major role in keeping the lid on at a time when many people predicted that there would be considerable trouble at Meridian. Students said, however, that though the transition is proceeding smoothly, integration is still a major problem in terms of informal acceptance and the real mixing of blacks and whites. Both races prefer to sit apart in the cafeteria; one group of students (all white) mentioned that "we're working on it." The absence of any major incidents since the period of integration began, is a plus for the administration.

Since 1968 there have been changes in the administration and organization of the college. The President had been responsible to the city superintendent, but as of the summer of 1971 the school apparently is no longer part of the city government system, and he now reports directly to the local school board.

The Vice President, a black 62-year-old administrator who transferred from Harris Junior College to Meridian, described the situation from his point of view. He feels that changes as far as race is concerned have been superficial. Real change (from desegregation to integration) will come slowly and with difficulty. He would like to see sensitivity training in order to help people understand the cultures of both the blacks and the whites. The Dean of Students also expressed the need for greater knowledge of the minorities, blacks and Indians, in terms of home situations, health, diet, and patterns of motivation.

More needs to be done for these low-income students in order to better meet their needs. As the Vice President stated, the black students need a more diverse vocational program and much encouragement to enter jobs, social activities, and the tutorial programs. There was one reference to a faculty committee on courses of study in Afro-American literature, funded by Title III. Hopefully this will be a seed that will germinate into an expanded curricular effort to eliminate a feeling of alienation among black students. As the President put it, "It is really like dealing with two different cultures."

This junior college is relying heavily on Title III funds in order to build Meridian to a level of quality respected by all levels of the community. Faculty members have been encouraged to obtain additional training and to earn higher degrees. The institution has sponsored conferences and workshops on topics such as the junior college system, subject matter areas, special services, instructional materials, and the development and use of media and research. Outside consultants, mostly from the University of Florida, have discussed all phases of the program with the staff and faculty. Faculty travel (one of the programs which have been greatly missed because of cuts in funds) has provided faculty members and students the opportunity to attend EPDA institutes to work on special problems. Over 100 meetings have been attended on the subject of media, institutional accountability, peer association, and remedial work; and visits to other colleges have been made to study special projects. The Academic Dean along with many other respondents observed that faculty development activities have been most beneficial. But he adds that "single-shot proposals designed to develop a single purpose are not most desirable. We need unified proposals tied to general college purpose and programs."

The Educational Media Center, because of its impact on the faculty, is considered one of the successful Title III programs. The interviewers saw the study carrels, the language laboratory, the radio, TV, film slide, and tape production centers, and the record, book and film collections. An attempt was made at a cultural series within the community, including films and musicians, but the supervisor of educational media admitted that this was not very successful.

In terms of remedial work, a developmental learning program for underachievers was begun under Title III but did not really get off the ground. The Higher Educational Achievement Program (HEAP) is now functioning, and there is a feeling that the HEAP students have benefited greatly from the offerings of the media center.

The counseling services provide one full-time counselor for every 200 students. Students know who the counselors are and seem to use them for all problems. There are arrangements with a mental hospital which provides good service for students who need such help. All areas of counseling are covered including diagnosing, special services (there was no explanation of what these services include), and adult counseling for students doing academic work from downtown areas. Title III monies were used for materials for the counselling programs. The hiring of more full-time male counselors would quiet the complaint of there being "too many women." And there is a need for an evaluation of counseling services, which may lead to the consolidation of counseling programs.

Title III monies have been cut considerably in the last year. Although various persons say that these funds are vital to the programs, it would appear that the various programs concerned, including professional development for the faculty, the media center, counseling, institutional research (emphasized recently), and faculty workshops, have continued on a more limited scale, without the full Title III awards.

Title III monies, which are requested through the National Institute of Health, seem to have a hand in many different areas. This is because all of the federal monies are integrated into the total budget for the institution, which is constructed by the Administrative Council. Title III is used to supplement other funds, and is independently audited annually as a part of the institutional audit.

Although Meridian is involved in a consortium, cooperation has been low with the consortium office. The OE regional office tends to be indecisive on matters such as student aid. Consortium arrangements have not been satisfactory in Mississippi and Alabama, so Meridian has generally gone to Florida to find consultants. However, theater arrangements have been made with Mississippi colleges. One English teacher felt that the media meeting held on campus was unsuccessful because of the director, who had a condescending attitude. This year, however, greater involvement in consortium activities has occurred at Meridian, including the exchange of materials, plays, and films. Funds have been pooled to begin a cooperative effort to help disadvantaged students in all junior colleges in Mississippi. Some respondents feel that the consortium could cut some of the existing program duplication and provide needed services. A group of teachers felt that their consortium arrangement was necessary to find those at other colleges with whom they can work satisfactorily, because of differences among colleges and colleagues in terms of readiness for integration.

As a consequence of the expansion of its technical program, Meridian has been attracting more students who want to get an education in that area. The students feel that the vocational preparation is good, although more vocational programs are needed. Jobs seem to be available for those who are willing to move.

Other students come to this school because of its low cost, because it is close to home, or because it has an "open-door" admission policy. One faculty member said that many of the students are too immature to leave home and go somewhere else. A cooperative program with the city is now in effect for the students who want training for jobs that will allow them to stay in Meridian.

Students preparing to transfer to a major college usually go to one of the three in the state: Mississippi State University, University of Southern Mississippi, or Jackson State University.

In terms of governance, the new Student Senate, which makes curriculum policy in some areas and which deals with student problems and activities, was considered a great step forward in student participation in decision-making. Its power is equal to that of the Faculty Senate, and there is a move to unite the two into a campus senate. Faculty members may participate in administrative decisions but few take advantage of this option. Though projects are initiated at the departmental level, decisions are clearly made at the top by the President and the Administrative Council.

It is true that people traditionally identify with senior colleges rather than with junior colleges, but the students are still proud of their school. Intramurals contribute to their sense of pride, but more sports, such as football, are needed to raise school spirit. An Alumni Association is just getting off the ground, so financial support from the alumni and community should be increased. There is talk of an open air radio station to improve community relations. The faculty, especially those who have been there a long time, feel strongly about the school and the students. Faculty members are club advisors; and socializing, which is encouraged, is possible through sports, parties, churches, plays, and clubs.

Meridian is making attempts to help all the students through emphasis on individualized instruction. But there is a need to give more attention--not only to brighter students (perhaps by giving honors in order to stimulate them) but also to students who are in the lower levels of ability.

Basically, the administrators know of Title III, and many faculty members know about the federal help, but they do not know specific programs or projects, nor do they know Title III by name. But a 30-year veteran of the faculty had this to say about the program: "Title III has been a godsend to the school since it created an enthusiasm for things we thought we could never afford and gave us resources we never could have received elsewhere."

Park College

(Kansas City, Missouri)

In an area dotted with many rather traditional private liberal arts institutions, Park College stands out as an unusual school. Small in comparison with other schools in the area (its total enrollment is about 600 students), Park College nevertheless shows a great deal of variety and many interesting and innovative features.

Students come from all over the Midwest as well as from the eastern seaboard. Although the proportion of foreign students is small, it still exceeds that of sister institutions in the area. Park College is proud of its large contingent of black students, who constitute more than 15 percent of the total enrollment; the college intends to increase this proportion even more in the near future. Park still attracts bright and creative students who would certainly be accepted by schools with higher academic requirements, but the college is now consciously attempting to cater more to "late bloomers," i.e., students who did poorly in high school but who are likely to do better in college. A large proportion of graduates go on to graduate school; a number of departments report that over half of their graduates chose this route in the recent past.

Unlike other colleges in the area, Park has an open dormitory policy for students who live on campus. The grading policies are very relaxed: a student can drop any course until the last week of the semester without sanction. The curriculum has recently been revised to reflect the college's growing concern with community problems. Park is intimately involved in the Cooperative Social Welfare Action Program (CO-SWAP), which is administered by the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE). The college's calendar has been changed to a modified semester system (4-1-4) with an intermission that is long enough to enable students to gain practical work experience in the community. Although this program does not yet have the scope of Antioch College's Cooperative Year, it is a first step in that direction.

There are no fraternities or sororities at Park College, and even intramural sports are not stressed. The formal social events which are generally quite important on other campuses are almost totally absent at Park. The permissive atmosphere at Park College makes it difficult for students to perceive the administration as their arch-enemy; nevertheless, students are very much involved in activist causes both inside and outside the college. For example, students last year pressured their school's President to make an official speech condemning racism in Parkville as the reason behind the failure of many of Park's black students in finding off-campus housing. Student involvement in campus governance takes place both formally--through student representatives on committees--and informally. Students are consulted regarding faculty appointments, and informal student pressure on the school's President has resulted in changes in tenure decisions in a few cases in which popular instructors were involved.

Park's faculty are very competent professionals despite the fact that most of them do not hold doctorates. On the whole, the faculty take their teaching responsibilities very seriously and encourage extensive student-faculty interaction both inside and outside the usual classroom and office setting. Park College appears to be a haven for very bright and imaginative but essentially noncompetitive academics who have no intention of rising to national prominence within their academic professions. The faculty appear to be very relaxed and open to anybody who may walk into their offices--almost all office doors at Park, including those of administrators, are permanently open.

Park's administration is presently in a rather precarious position and has been in that position for over a decade. A high turnover in top administrative positions (dean, business manager, director of planning and development) has not contributed much toward cementing the rather fragile faculty-administration relationships. However, there is now a pervasive feeling of optimism among all groups on campus that a period of administrative stability without antagonisms among the different groups may be ahead. Park's most serious problem, however, may remain unsolved for some time--its lack of a President who can offer strong leadership and who will be able to attract sorely needed funds.

While all groups on campus participate to some degree in the internal governance of the campus, the same can not be said for the external governance. Neither students nor faculty are represented as full members on the Board of Trustees, although some faculty and students do serve on some trustee committees. Park's President believes--and he thinks that most trustees share his belief--that the Board of Trustees should remain outside student and faculty influence. The Board of Trustees includes a large number of nationally known educators, who were elected to the Board for their innovative ideas on education rather than for their potential ability to donate large sums to the college or to attract such monies from other donors.

Park College as a whole is, of course, more than the sum of the different groups which constitute the college community. The air of informality is strong and is reflected not only in the appearance of students and most faculty (both would be inconspicuous on such a large campus as the University of California at Berkeley) but also in the informal relationships among all groups.

While the location of the campus and its large forest is beautiful, the appearance of the buildings and grounds is not. Park's strained financial resources make it impossible for the school to employ a sufficiently large maintenance crew; as a result, even simple maintenance jobs are carried out infrequently. Small wonder that under the present circumstances the much needed renovation of old buildings and the construction of a badly needed library are totally out of the question.

While Park College is the new coordinating institution for the Title III/1965 HEA program within the KCRCHE consortium, its involvement in past activities financed by Title III has been rather limited. Only about half a dozen Park faculty ever participated in Title III-sponsored faculty improvement workshops. Park acknowledges the potential usefulness of the KCRCHE telephone network, which was developed with Title III funds, but very little use is made of this facility at the present time.

Park's inability to take greater advantage of Title III funds has been due to the college's past peripheral relationship with the KCRCHE consortium and to a general lack of good communication between faculty and administration. The college hopes to remedy the situation by appointing a new dean (the post has been vacant for some time) and by assuming the responsibility of KCRCHE consortium coordinator. Although only a very few faculty participated in faculty development workshops, that area seems to be the one in which Park is least deficient. Much more critical are the areas of student services and administrative development. As the number of minority students increases (the college is determined to admit more minority students), student services will become an area of prime importance. If the school is to survive and grow, it needs competent administrators who will be able to bridge the gap between faculty and administration by improving internal communications between the different groups. Also, the college will need to put considerably more emphasis on fund-raising and improving relations between the school and the surrounding community.

Rockhurst College

(Kansas City, Missouri)

Rockhurst College, a large and complex four-year institution located in Kansas City, Missouri, describes itself as "a Jesuit College for men and women." The college's white staff and students (1,200 day students and 1,500 evening students) stand in stark contrast to the surrounding black community. Campus-community relations have been strained recently by a number of minor racial incidents. Last year, for example, a cross was burned on campus. The two white students involved were suspended, and an interracial committee was formed to deal with future racial difficulties. With the exception of this committee, however, little concern is apparent about the obviously precarious position of this white institution in a predominantly black neighborhood. Of the 1,200 day students, only 30 are black. Regrettably, the institution does not appear to be taking any major steps to remedy this situation. In fact, except for Upward Bound, programs designed to deal with disadvantaged college students do not formally exist at Rockhurst, although some faculty members do volunteer individual assistance on a limited basis.

The institution's major concern is to educate its present students, who are white, middle class, and mainly Catholic. Rockhurst's students are primarily concerned with receiving an accredited degree and show little interest in politics or social issues. Between commuter and on-campus day students there exists a rift which may be the result of segregated facilities (such as day-rooms and cafeterias). Cliques develop along commuter versus on-campus student lines, so that the two groups have very little contact with each other outside the classroom.

To increase enrollment (dorms still have vacancies), Rockhurst recently became a coeducational institution. Although the long-range effects of this change can not be predicted, it appears that this new dimension might make the atmosphere somewhat less solemn. There is also the possibility that there will be major curriculum changes as a result of the new feminine influence. The business division, for example, has an excellent reputation and towers over other divisions in its number of faculty and students. It is thought--hoped among some--that one effect of the co-eds will be to strengthen the humanities and fine arts.

Rockhurst's faculty (20% of whom are Jesuits) have moderate academic qualifications--over 25% hold doctorates. Interaction between faculty members is quite limited, although no interfaculty antagonism seems to result from this. Faculty-student interaction appears to be on the rise among the lay staff, although students rarely have social contact with Jesuit faculty. Faculty irritation with the administration seems to be spread across all segments to a moderate degree. The rigid administrative structure of the institution seems to frustrate faculty members who are interested in effecting change. From its governing board down, Rockhurst has an extremely bureaucratic administrative structure in which every administrative position is clearly defined. In effect, this prohibits the concerned and creative members of both the faculty and administration from getting involved outside of their designated realms. (This was noted by one administrator as the reason why Rockhurst has difficulties in retaining its younger bright staff members.) For example, the Board of Directors consists of seven Jesuits, five of whom reside at Rockhurst. This board meets monthly to decide major policy items, which have supposedly been raised in the administrative committees. Of the nineteen functioning committees, these five men serve on fourteen, often with two of them on one committee. All five serve on the important Executive Committee of the Faculty General Assembly. It is no wonder that both administrators and faculty complain of a conservative, sometimes stifling, atmosphere on campus.

Nonetheless, as a result of its highly organized and effective administration, Rockhurst College is by any standard a successful institution that is well within the mainstream of American higher education. Neither academically nor financially could Rockhurst be described as a "struggling institution." In fact, it could well be a model to emulate for many "developed" institutions of the same type (i.e., Catholic four-year colleges). Rockhurst has been able to increase its enrollment at a time when other four-year, private, liberal arts colleges in the Kansas City area have suffered from decreasing enrollments. The school's very astute budgeting and fund-raising policies are bringing in substantial amounts of money that schools with a less sophisticated approach to financial matters are only dreaming about.

Rockhurst has three major sources of income: first, it has a very successful fund-raising policy in the local community (most Rockhurst alumni live in Kansas City, and an amazingly large proportion of established professionals in the city are Rockhurst alumni). A second important source of income are federal and foundation grants for various purposes, which the school has been able to obtain within the last few years. The third major source of income is the college's evening division, which continuously enrolls more students than its day-time program. (As one administrator put it, the evening school is a real "money-maker.") The most obvious sign of Rockhurst's financial success is its physical plant and grounds. The campus consists of eleven modern, well maintained buildings, with a large track and field area placed between three dormitories and a gymnasium. The newest building on campus is the impressive three-story library, which boasts a mezzanine (and which was federally funded).

Rockhurst's Involvement with Title III

Because of Rockhurst's extensive involvement with the Kansas City Regional Conference for Higher Education (KCRCHE) over the past several years, along with its generally heavy federal funding (last year alone, Rockhurst received $300,000 from federal sources other than Title III), it is nearly impossible to specify in what manner X number of Title III dollars effected change in particular areas. In general, Rockhurst's administration feels Title III has been helpful in the following ways:

1. It has given Rockhurst's faculty and administration an ordered way (via KCRCHE's tele-network) to develop better communication with other local staffs.

2. Title III has allowed Rockhurst access to experts through seminars and workshops which it would not otherwise have been able to afford. Both administrators and faculty stressed this.

3. It has substantially assisted the faculty in improving its academic qualifications by supporting their efforts to attend graduate institutions in the surrounding area.

4. Again via KCRCHE, Title III has enabled Rockhurst to get involved in long-range (10 year) planning.

5. By placing NTF's on campus in the past, Title III was essentially giving the school direct operating assistance for faculty salaries.

Given the general level of competence of Rockhurst's administrative staff, the school's history of active involvement with KCRCHE, and the institution's fund-raising ability, it seems probable that (with the exception of item 5) most of the above items would have occurred with or without the assistance of Title III.

Rockhurst has successfully used its Title III funds, just as it has managed most of its federal funding in a successful manner. It would, indeed, be surprising, given the general level of competence of Rockhurst's faculty, if anything else had occurred. Rockhurst does not in any way appear to be a developing institution; the major question, then, does not seem to be which programs initiated by Title III were most successful, but rather why Rockhurst was funded in the first place. For it is obvious that Rockhurst's present success has not occurred just recently.

Mount Saint Mary College

(Hooksett, New Hampshire)

Mount Saint Mary College is a small, parochial women's college in southern New Hampshire; its enrollment is less than 300. Graduates generally go into teaching, social work, or marriage. Accordingly, the school offers its strongest "areas of concentration" in education, social welfare, and home economics.

Mount Saint Mary is more secular in its approach to education than many other parochial schools. There is no compulsory attendance at religious services though "they are well attended anyway." Recently the first lay faculty in the school's history were hired.

Student respondents agreed that the few restrictions still enforced were both "necessary and good." In general, students said they felt "very free" on campus and enjoyed close relationships with the faculty and administration. One student, a member of the Social Committee, noted, "There's quite a bit of freedom in dating boys from other campuses. We're planning a beer blast for next weekend. The administration might get a little uptight about that, but I think we can have it."

In the same vein, an interviewer commented, "There is a relaxed atmosphere here, much more than I expected at a parochial school." Evidently, the "relaxed atmosphere" is a recent development. "Morale has changed during the last two years," one administrator said. "It was not high then; now it is high and getting higher."

Two factors have contributed to this change--a change in the religious life of nuns to a more "liberal" type (e.g., more modern habits) and an administrative decision to personalize service for students. "That year of upheaval, 1970, with the killings at Kent State and all, made us think. It made us re-examine our relationship to our students. We had not personally concerned ourselves with them before. . . . We began to realize the importance and power of the students," the President explained.

Students now have places on all administrative committees, except the most powerful one, the Committee for Administration and Planning. The President insisted that decision-making was more and more at the level "where most people will be affected by it" and that students "have voices in making decisions which apply to them wherever that is possible." Though they registered no objection to the arrangement, the student respondents felt that the administration still "made the decisions."

One thing is certain: regardless of what group is making them, the decisions that are being made now are more "liberal" than the ones made in the past. Students do seem to have more influence in some areas. The grading system has been changed to allow students to take courses on a "pass-fail" basis for the first time; rules have been relaxed, and students are participating in many of the new committees that have been formed during the last two years.

Several other changes have taken place at Mount Saint Mary. A major science program has been added to the curriculum. New faculty have been hired to reduce the previously excessive number of teaching hours carried by the faculty. There has been a change from the semester plan to the "4-1-4" plan; the physical plant has been expanded; and students have been able to study at neighboring schools with better curricula in their areas of interest.

All of these latter changes, with the exception of the plant expansion, have been consequent to Mount Saint Mary's participation in the New Hampshire College and University Council (NHCUC). NHCUC, an extremely robust organization of eight area schools, is almost entirely funded by Title III. All Title III benefits coming to Mount Saint Mary flow directly from consortium-planned cooperative programs that also affect the other participating institutions.

In many cases, NHCUC has usurped major administrative responsibilities from the individual schools. For example, when the schools decided collectively to switch from a semester year to the "4-1-4" plan, all participating schools made the change. Though consortium literature emphasizes the need for more cooperation, commitment to the consortium is evidently very high.

The "4-1-4" plan shortens the traditional semester from four and one-half months to four months and creates an "interim term" during which students take one comprehensive "special-interest" course. All interim term courses and activities are open to all students of the NHCUC colleges. So that students may take full advantage of the cooperative program, there is no exchange of board, room, or tuition, nor any additional cost for transferring to another campus. The January courses tend to be more diverse and unconventional than the semester courses. There are hundreds of these special courses, and many of them include travel in the United States and abroad at some extra expense.

The consortium also centralizes several areas of routine administration. Centralized purchasing means reduced prices for Mount Saint Mary and the other schools. The consortium has a computer for cooperative use which none of the schools could possibly have purchased for itself alone. The consortium acts as a centralized collection and distribution agency. All handling of financial aids to students, for example, is done as a centralized consortium service.

The consortium's executive board, to which the Presidents of all of the schools belong, apportions monies to the schools through a process of weighing the school's request against the consortium's resources and priorities. Because of its small size, Mount Saint Mary may receive less consideration in some areas. For example, the consortium has sent 29 faculty back to school for advanced study, but only a couple have been from Mount Saint Mary.

Still, there is little doubt that Mount Saint Mary receives its proportionate share and, because of the cooperative nature of most of the programs, even more than its proportionate share. No one at Mount Saint Mary, at least among those interviewed, criticized the consortium; instead the consortium was unanimously praised by the respondents. One administrator raved, "The consortium is the biggest thing that ever happened to us."

There is much truth in her contention. The consortium has probably helped "relax" Mount Saint Mary more than either the change in religious life or the student protests of 1970. The consortium has pushed Mount Saint Mary into a system of inter-institutional cooperation which has opened the protective walls of the school to other daily influences. The student exchange, for example, allows students from Mount Saint Mary to study at another school which offers a stronger department in a field of their interest, not only during the January term but during the semester as well. In turn, students from the other schools come to Mount Saint Mary to take advantage of its relatively strong English, education, and home economics curricula.

Students also participate in the cooperative marine sciences program which is associated with Suffolk University. The council is a full partner with Suffolk in the use of a marine station in northern Maine. Students and faculty participate in the visiting scholars program, which sent seven prominent scholars to Mount Saint Mary for speaking activities during the last academic year.

The librarians of the colleges with funds for a weekly truck service have developed much-used channels of exchange. Basic but little-used materials of a scholarly nature are jointly purchased and centrally housed. The consortium libraries have developed subject-area concentrations and an expanded inter-library loan system.

In addition, the original consortium study of its participating institutions has proven "very valuable," according to the President, as a planning and development tool for the school itself. "Just being able to get together with talent from various colleges in the area for discussion of common problems" was described as "the great thing about the consortium" by the registrar.

Based solely on responses from Mount Saint Mary, it appears that the consortium is moving towards a very interesting goal--creating through cooperation one very good university out of eight mediocre colleges. At the same time, most of the particular characteristics of the schools, at least those of Mount Saint Mary, have been preserved. Oonsequently, the school still has its special problems to confront. One administrator, for instance, felt the curriculum needed to be expanded in areas in which the consortium could not help. Another felt that, although remaining as small as possible was an advantage, enrollment should be boosted up to 300. There is no question, however, that at Mount Saint Mary the larger problems of survival and progress would have long since taken precedence over these minor ones had the NHCUC never been organized. Only because of the consortium can Mount Saint Mary boast of its present smallness without worrying about diminishing even further in the future.

New England College

(Henniker, New Hampshire)

"Getting rid of pot-bellied stoves in the classrooms" was one major change seen by an administrator during his eleven years at New England College. NEC is a vital part of the small town of Henniker, New Hampshire, and has recently witnessed many other changes as well.

A spirit of development and new life rings out from all corners of this growing campus. The students, faculty, and administration will agree that the coming of the new President three years ago was the beginning of a great leap forward and also a great leap towards working together within the school. The President has delegated authority to various people. The past President "did it all" and held to that role. Now faculty, students (who have representation and voting on all committees), and administrators share in the decision-making processes (though the President makes final decisions); but the same people tend to sit on all the committees.

Students make recommendations and usually get good responses from the administration, though they feel the faculty ignores student input into governance. The student government handles $100,000 of the student fees for the activity fund. There is a move towards a change in the faculty-administrative relationship. The previous Vice President for Academic Affairs (there is a new one this year) held a "split view." They are now working towards a better arrangement and, with three new vice presidents, they will have a closer relationship.

Students are attracted to NEC because of its good vocational program (along with its good geographical location, i.e., ski slopes). With classes in Business Administration and Education (along with their liberal arts education), the students are well prepared for the job market when they graduate (and those who do go on to graduate school compete easily). Expanded offerings and 4-1-4 as a result of Title III are helping attract newer students also. But there is a growing desire for even more major fields. As one respondent said, "many students come because they cannot get into other places and then want to transfer because they cannot get a particular major they want."

The students interviewed were asked, "Why are blacks here?" (there are six to eight black students) to which they answered, "To play basketball on scholarship, and their girlfriends." This is a major problem, especially socially.

With the purchase of Arundel Campus in England (purchased for $200,000--half paid by gifts and the rest by a six-year loan), the President wants to continue in international education. The student body and faculty have been increased to operate this branch, and there is a lot of traffic between New Hampshire and England by administrative officers. Also, by means of a Director of Further Education, the President wants to include international experiences. Extensive use of Arundel in summers will make this possible.

Also among the recent changes at NEC is the growing number and quality of faculty due to Title III's NTF program. There is a good working relationship between faculty and students, with a 1:12 ratio.

The faculty has a strong belief in the college, and much cooperation comes from the newer and younger faculty members. They are showing interest in, and being trained to use, closed circuit and film production. Also, the new faculty are making use of the library, something which was not done before, much to the disappointment of the library director and the new President. This is understandable, since library improvement--an inter-library loan program--was considered one of the benefits of the consortium. One of the administrators felt that the library improvement was the key that led to accreditation in 1967.

There are no formal remedial programs per se at NEC, but the students have access to individual faculty members for help regarding academic advising. The Humanities division is now proposing reading and writing remedial programs, realizing that the college should have paid more attention to student needs. One administrator felt there was little need for remedial programs so far because of the students attracted to NEC. The student group interviewed felt that there is a great need for counseling. The College Counselor is "at home 24 hours per day." There is a resident counselor at one dorm and also an Associate Dean of Students, but this is not adequate. Four visits to a psychiatrist are included in the health insurance, and the students voiced a need for a resident gynecologist.

All of the students interviewed want a swimming pool, and one administrator would like to see the crowded student facilities expanded into a student center. This is a major need due to the isolation and lack of transportation. The President would like to see the development of a Humanities Center which could be used year round for performing arts. This would be for the benefit of the state, the consortium, high school students, and adults, as well as for NEC. He feels this could be an area of strength they could develop as part of the consortium.

New England College is indeed an important segment of Henniker. The students come to NEC because of the pleasant college-community atmosphere and unique faculty-student rapport. There is much informal socializing between students (especially older students) and faculty in addition to the impromptu and traditional socializing among faculty and administration. The community is also included in the socializing both on and off campus. There is a pub on campus, and some classes meet there. The students operate a co-op day-care center at one dorm, and they have also cleaned the town and formed the Henniker Environmental Study Group.

The President was disappointed at the lack of interest in student activities on the part of the faculty when he first came. But now hockey and the new football team have brought out faculty and students. One thing leads to another--more are participating. He made the decision to add football to bring people out together, to build participation. (One administrator had a negative attitude toward the installation of football because it takes half of the scholarship money. But this person appeared extremely bitter, a "real downer" with very little positive to say, according to the interviewer.)

NEC's involvement with Title III, explained the former Title III coordinator (now Director of Development), is through faculty development, library improvement, and the centralized consortium (New Hampshire University and College Council, NHUCC) office. The centralized consortium office has been the most useful Title III program. Benefits from this cooperation include avoidance of duplication of courses, improvement of library services (specifically an inter-library loan program), centralized purchasing, and improvement of the counseling program (though, according to students, more improvements could be made).

The Educational Media Director would like to see an interconnection of campuses of the consortium by means of television, and especially the use of a two-way system in the future.

All Title III monies go to St. Anselms College (fiscal agent for the consortium) first; they are then distributed from there to various other schools. NEC handles the payroll for the consortium office, which involves simply paying money according to contracts by direction of St. Anselms.

An "unofficial" Title III coordinator on NEC's campus receives grant requests from individual faculty members. The coordinator sends the requests on to the consortium central office. After the grant has been approved, the money goes to St. Anselms College and then to the other individual campuses. So all funds come from the consortium--they get no money directly from the USOE. Money from the consortium has come regularly for faculty development.

Title III per se has a very low profile on campus. However, almost everyone is enthusiastic about the consortium involvement--students, faculty, and administrators. It is seen as an essential part of the institution's growth. If Title III funds are cut, the effects would be minimal since the consortium seems determined to continue its operation.

NEC's active participation in the NHUCC is due to their President, who is also president of the consortium and who meets each Monday morning with the consortium director.

Amidst the growth and change, many students want the school to stay small and to maintain advantages it now has. The faculty want more thorough participation in change and more carefully planned change. Members of the administration mentioned that they would like things to level off--the college shoud stop and look because things are happening too fast. According to both of the interviewers, if "planning to determine the future of the institution takes place in an orderly fashion, New England College may survive as a viable institution. If growth, as such, just continues and the college simply adjusts, the prospects for a 'developed' institution are not good. The addition this fall (1971) of a 'branch' campus in England (Arundel Castle) seems to be having a great impact--both negative and positive. This may give new prestige to the institution since it is a unique move for a struggling private college, or it might prove to be such a drain that it will have serious detrimental effects on the Henniker institution." Evidence shows that NEC must look before making any more leaps.

The many recent changes: expansion of the physical plant, increase in size of the student body, curriculum change, loosening of student requirements (academic and social), the recent purchase of an English campus, reorganization of administrative structure, all reflect the ongoing spirit of growth and new life. This is especially related to Title III through the new President, who worked with the consortium previously while at the University of New Hampshire. His dynamic approach has won the cooperation of the staff. And the students? . . . They can rap with him, and "he brings it together."

Rivier College

(Nashua, New Hampshire)

Rivier College, a small, suburban, Catholic women's college, caters to the daughters (most of whom are first generation college students) of working-class families. The students, who basically want career preparation, seem to enjoy the all-girl academic environment and do not want the school to become co-ed. The parents are happy about the protective rules (all girls must live in dormitories) and about the developing curriculum at Rivier.

The only affiliation with Title III has been through the consortium (NHCUC) since 1966. The cooperative arrangment has provided Rivier College with programs in curriculum change, faculty development with NFT's, 4-1-4 scheduling, and library improvements.

All seven of the administrator-respondents mentioned the new joint marine biology course as having been initiated by the consortium. The program, which is now funded with other federal funds, benefited most (according to the two biology teachers) from the joint arrangement for the purchase of equipment. The course meetings rotate among the participating schools, and they have had speakers through the Visiting Scholars Program.

The assistant math professor appeared very eager to share her work in computer terminals for instructional purposes. Rivier participated in the NSF-Consortium program with the University of New Hampshire in experimenting with computers for instructional use. After the three-year project ended, remaining funds were used to supply each college with a terminal to keep. The terminal is hooked to Dartmouth College. Rivier pays for time and shares this ten-hour part with two other Catholic girls' schools. Each school gets prime time by a rotating schedule arrangement.

The consortium paid for the math teacher's inservice training at two national conferences. She now gives computer programming in Basic Language as an elective and also offers an advanced course. She would like to teach a course about computers and later give training in data processing for vocational purposes, but equipment is needed. She feels that all students could benefit by participating in the program to supplement other classwork.

The idea for the 4-1-4 plan, which started in 1970, came from the consortium committee and was sold to the faculty. There was a lot of enthusiasm for the calendar change for class scheduling. After a year in operation, 4-1-4 seems to be creating anxiety in faculty members. The interim period requires much outside contact, and there is not enough time to come up with fresh ideas and to do a really good job. The interim period did not appear to be academically high-powered. A Spanish teacher complained that 4-1-4 has hurt his subject because students require more time to learn, not less.

Prior to the Title III funds, the college libraries had cooperated through the help of the state library, particularly through a union catalog. A consultant, who was provided by the consortium for an entire year, was helpful in calling attention to areas that needed improvement. The head librarian felt that the regular meetings of librarians are helpful because it is important for them to keep in contact with each other. The consortium has been of great value, not only because faculty and students like the inter-library loan system, but also because each library and school is working toward building a specialty. Rivier's library is strong in French literature because of its graduate program in the field.

In the area of library improvements, more money is needed to hook Rivier up to the New England library computer network (NELINET). Also, the library should be used more by faculty and students, particularly for independent study. The advent of 4-1-4 has helped, but perhaps faculty and students need to learn how they can use the library services more.

The Title III monies are distributed to Rivier College by the consortium's fiscal agent, St. Anselm's College. The money is allocated for restricted purposes, and a report of the expenditures is made to the consortium. If the funds were terminated, Rivier's programs with the consortium would continue but with narrower roles and functions for visiting scholars. The library cooperation would continue to operate with help from the state library, as it did before Title III.

Besides the benefits derived from the new programs, Rivier has become more open and less provincial due to its affiliation with the consortium. The institution is looking beyond its boundaries. But some of the administrators feel that changes are coming too fast. They want a "leveling off" period so the consortium can take time to consolidate the gains already made. Other respondents would like to see more consortium activity, such as more joint class scheduling, more cooperative sports programs, and a central placement office. Students would like to see semester-long or year-long faculty exchanges between campuses, and the two biology teachers want faculty seminars on their discipline.

Rivier is now an independent college governed by a private board which includes religious and secular members, and it is staffed by a religious order, although the number of lay faculty has increased over the past few years. From the answers given in the interviews, the lay faculty seem to be faced with several problems, especially the male faculty members. They find that everything is "strictly professional," even between faculty and administrators. However, the situation is quite different for the faculty sisters (nuns) because most of the administrators are also sisters. Sisters also live on each floor of the student dormitories.

When asked who cares for the school, the secular faculty said they really do because they are staking their future on it. (And apparently they are not always informed as to what is going on, so they get frustrated.) Other respondents felt that everyone is equally concerned with the school. Because of a general loosening of academic requirements so that students have more input into (and more responsibility for) their own education, there has been a more positive attitude on the part of both students and faculty. The service of the religious order indicates a great deal of caring. The sisters contribute to this service by giving the college their salaries, except for living expenses.

There appears to be a difference of opinion regarding the need for professional counseling and remedial help. Presently these services are available on an individual and voluntary basis in an informal setting between faculty and students. Some respondents feel that because this is a small college, the present system can continue satisfactorily. Others would like to see a full-time counseling staff at Rivier. Students are trying to create more opportunities for informal counseling.

The most often mentioned recent incidents seem to be related to loosening of rules, academically and socially, and (since the Kent State shootings) more student participation in governance. In March, 1970, there was a "demonstration" in which the girls walked quietly around the sidewalks after curfew. This resulted in extended curfew hours. Also, the dress code and senior comprehensive exams have been abolished.

Although the interviewers called Rivier a developing institution due to its participation in the consortium, they did not see much enthusiasm or commitment on the part of the institution. Rivier functions to provide career preparation for its students and does not want to be in the "mainstream." All know about the consortium, and some feel it is a good involvement; whereas others feel Rivier should not take part if it is not going to benefit as much as everyone else.

Saint Anselm's College

(Manchester, New Hampshire)

St. Anselm's College is one of a declining breed--a college of the Benedictine Order. Though the college remains under monastical governance, the secularization of its affairs is a clear trend. Fifteen years ago, 60% of the staff was religious; today lay staff outnumber religious staff by more than ten to one. Once students preparing to become monks were given a free education at St. Anselm's, but now they are given only a 25% discount on tuition. The number of such students has declined markedly while the lay occupational programs have increased in popularity.

Though the size of the college has tripled since 1960, the student body is still less than 1,500. According to respondents, students are attracted to the college by their desire (or, more likely, their parents' desire) for a parochial education and because the college is "still small enough to offer individualized attention." The parochial education is now less parochial, however, and (administrators believe) more educational. For example, the emphasis has shifted in theology to a "more open and ecumenical approach." The non-religious programs have been expanded. For instance (and surprisingly for an all-male school), St. Anselm's has a very strong nursing program in which 300 students are enrolled. The college has recently attempted to be of service to its immediate community by offering nursing services, and this too represents quite a change from its hermit-like past.

The amount of individualized attention the college offers is a matter of controversy. The growth of the staff has not in all cases been proportional to the growth of the student body. The college retains only two counselors, for example, and "they do not have time to do enough individual counseling." The gradual change from religious to lay staff has also caused much controversy, and some tension as well. "There has been some polarization between the basically lay faculty and the basically religious administration," one administrator reported, adding that faculty-administration socializing was "almost non-existent."

Most respondents felt that morale was high, however, due to the recent reaffirmation of the college's accreditation, the 1968 "self-study" which evidently led to improvements in conditions and communications, and the "gratifying" level of alumni support. Students have gained power and higher morale, according to administration and faculty respondents, since their peace demonstrations following the Kent State tragedy. "Teachers and administrators have been forced to let up a bit and acknowledge--and, even more important, realize--that students have great power," the President explained. Though students have been added to administrative committees since that time, student respondents felt that their power was minimal. They did express a high degree of contentment and happiness with the college, however, which seemed to confirm the administrators' belief that student morale was generally high.

If the students are not the main governing force on campus, neither are the administrators. The monastery through its representatives on the "Little Chapter" (the governing body of the college) still exerts the major policy influence. The school also has a board of trustees, but, as one faculty member put it, "The trustees are advisory; the Little Chapter is where the power is."

While the Kent State demonstrations and the change in staff from religious to lay have both left their mark on the campus, probably the incident which most greatly affected the college was the formation of the very successful Title III consortium, the New Hampshire Council of Universities and Colleges (NHCUC). Title III funds precipitated the formation of the consortium when in 1965 New England College, a recipient of original Title III funds, approached St. Anselm's, suggesting that the two schools start planning sessions. From these modest beginnings, NHCUC has grown into a cooperative body of eight schools organized into thirteen major committees of 130 college representatives with the goal of "moving academic interdependence beyond theory to demonstrated fact."

The application of "academic interdependence" through NHCUC arose out of the fears of the eight participating institutions that individually they would be facing a bleak future of higher costs, unpredictable sources of income, harmful competition, outmoded educational philosophies and abilities, and perhaps consequent failure to survive. Through reliance on cooperation, the schools reasoned, they might reduce costs and competition while improving academic offerings and campus spirit. In varying degrees, the consortium has proved successful in accomplishing each of these goals at St. Anselm's.

Costs have been reduced through centralized administration of financial aids and fund-raising efforts, joint purchasing, and cooperative use of educational media, computers, and library resources. More important for students and faculty has been the improvement of educational opportunities. The Student Exchange allows students at one college to take courses not offered at their college at one of the other participating colleges. St. Anselm's students have been able to take advantage of the strong English, foreign languages, and music programs at Notre Dame College, while women from Mount Saint Mary College have come to St. Anselm's to study biology, chemistry, philosophy, and political science. The presence of these women on campus has provoked a movement to make the college coeducational. In addition, the 4-1-4 calendar allows students to take less conventional "special interest" courses during each January term, and Visiting Scholar and Teacher Lecture programs have "effectively supplemented the educational process."

The consortium agreed early in its history to have St. Anselm's emphasize and develop a marine science program. The program was developed with Title III funds and was greatly aided by the joint purchase, with Suffolk University, of a "splendid site and marine facility" in northern Maine. Credit is now being awarded to students upon completion of the consortium course in introductory marine sciences, and the facilities have also been used extensively by faculty researchers. The program is no longer funded by Title III but continues under the funding of another agency.

Faculty have received many other benefits as well. A number of faculty have been allowed to study for graduate degrees with released time provided by Title III faculty development grants. Several respondents noted that instruction had improved at St. Anselm's and that some of this improvement should be attributed to the consortium workshops on instructional techniques.

Joint consortium booking has allowed St. Anselm's to give its students a varied cultural fare for the first time. During 1971, for example, the Vienna Chamber Concert Orchestra and the "Superstar" touring company drew big crowds at St. Anselm's. According to many respondents, neither performance could have been held without joint sponsorship.

Many administrators would agree with the one who remarked that the consortium has resulted "in a sort of loose federation without any loss of identity to any college." If there has been no loss of identity at St. Anselm's, the components of that identity have at least been greatly influenced by the college's participation in the consortium. The principal influence appears to be towards creating a more liberal and open, rather than conservative and protective, college at St. Anselm's.

There was some concern expressed about the reduction of Title III funding. In 1968, the consortium received $213,000, its highest appropriation. In 1969 and 1970, funding dropped to $170,000. Because of the reduction, the schools were forced to curtail faculty development programs. If all goes according to plan, in three years the NHCUC schools will form the first "non-cluster interdependent model in American higher education." The President of St. Anselm's expressed the most emphatic concern that the move from cooperation to interdependence would be "derailed by insufficient funding in the next three years."

The President has excellent reasons for expressing his concern on this matter. Cooperation has been very helpful--some would say indispensable--to his college. Given the college's new orientation to education (an orientation which has been greatly encouraged and, to some extent, provoked by this cooperation) and given the threatening economic picture, there is compelling reason to suggest that "interdependence" would be even more helpful to St. Anselm's than "cooperation" has been.

Barber-Scotia College

(Concord, North Carolina)

Barber-Scotia College, a small, black, four-year institution which at one time was open only to women, appears to be struggling to maintain its existence despite inadequate funds. The lack of funds has hurt the college, especially by contributing to its inability to hold highly qualified faculty and staff.

Traditionally, Barber-Scotia has served clients of high academic levels and affluent status. Because of the increased competition for students with good academic backgrounds, there has been a definite decline in enrollment of students of this caliber. The college felt it necessary to begin the recruitment of students who had college level ability, but who were deficient at some levels. This caused the institution to rethink its role in view of the anticipated change in clientele.

A few of the changes made included a revision of the charter to admit men and a change to an open admission policy with no cut-off point for SAT scores in determining acceptance of new students. Curriculum improvements have been made in order to meet the needs of the changed study body. Home Economics as a major was dropped due to a lack of interest. An Early Childhood Education major has been initiated which helps to prepare the many students who teach after graduation. Because there are now men students at Barber-Scotia, a greater emphasis has been placed upon careers in business, industry, and sports. A sociology major has been added, which has permitted the hiring of two sociology professors.

The change in admission policies has made it necessary to improve the special services to aid the new clientele. The Freshmen-Sophomore General Studies Program (GSP), funded by Title III, has immensely helped the students, many of whom could not get into other schools. Under GSP (which replaced the traditional General Education Program) students stay in a course until they complete it satisfactorily rather than ending the course by failing, as under the previous system. But GSP is far from perfect, and funds are needed to provide smaller classes and further individualization of phases of the program.

Although the College Placement Service (funded by Title III) has helped the students by making it possible for them to enter nontraditional jobs, it is badly in need of more career counselors. The counseling services need refinement and additional staff with more technical competence. The need for the services of a psychometrist was mentioned.

Barber-Scotia's consortium affiliation has been responsible for the speed with which changes are being made. Placement and supervision of student teachers, exchange courses, guest lecturers, and the joint hiring of faculty and staff have been the main consortium activities. A study was made of recruitment and admission of students, and the data from this study was used for improved counseling and guidance services by the members of the consortium. The staff and faculty of Barber-Scotia have seen the benefits that can be derived from a cooperative arrangement. Better planning has been made from pooled information, and strong resource persons with competency in a specific discipline have provided an opportunity for students to study with qualified faculty. It is not possible to provide an equally strong faculty in each discipline on each campus at present.

Most of the respondents were familiar with the consortium, and those who were more involved had suggestions for its improvement. They felt that some type of transportation should be provided to facilitate the arrangements, a cooperative computer center should be established that would service the institutions, teams from participating colleges should be sent to workshops and seminars, in-service training to prepare teachers for teacher-counselor roles was needed, and a media center and a black cultural center should be established.

There was also talk of steps toward a merger with another college. A group of students mentioned the proposed merger with Johnson C. Smith College as an important incident that had taken place within the last few years. They said it impressed them because "our trustee board was concerned about what was best for the students, and Johnson C. Smith's trustee board was concerned more with its loss of identity."

Title III is not seen as a frill but as a vital part of the development of the institution. Funds are needed to attract sincere teachers and staff who are qualified to relate successfullly to the students, to expand curricular offerings (such as a law enforcement program and majors in computer science and urban affairs), and to improve the present student services in counseling. If funds were cut, the institution would be in deep trouble.

The Title III monies are sent directly from Washington to individual members of the consortium on the basis of approved proposals. They are allotted on the basis of approved requisitions by the business manager and are audited on campus. One complaint mentioned at most colleges that have Title III funds, and this one is no exception, is the desire to have unrestricted use of the funds.

Another change that has taken place was the hiring of a young, dynamic President who is more aware of student needs and who is quite an improvement over the previous well qualified, traditional administrator. The decision-making is now a democratic process with a committee structure that allows all to participate. Any curriculum change is sent to the faculty for final approval.

It was stated that, despite the lack of funds, teacher morale is high. This might be because the dedicated faculty members remain, although they could leave to find better salaries elsewhere. It appears that they even work with students on Saturdays in order to strengthen the recreational program.

With the expansion of the physical facilities, including a new dormitory, gymnasium, and student union, a senior student said the campus no longer looks like a high school. But the student respondents would like to see the library renovated and a band and football team formed.

Barber-Scotia has seen many changes in the past few years and, if it is to survive, it must continue to provide for the needs of the students. So far, Title III seems to have been a major contributor to the substantial progress being made by Barber-Scotia.

Elizabeth City State University

(Elizabeth City, North Carolina)

During the last ten years, Elizabeth City State University (ECSU) has been gradually changing from a teacher preparation school to a liberal arts university. Ten new majors have been added during that time, and a corresponding number of new buildings have also been constructed, tripling the size of the physical plant. However, it was not until four years ago when a new president of the university assumed office, that efforts in this direction really accelerated. The President, through his vigorous efforts in securing federal and foundation support, in decentralizing decision-making, and in revamping the curriculum has played a major role in improving and redirecting ECSU.

In 1969, the North Carolina state legislature changed the school's status from college to university. This had an effect that was in line with the school's plans for growth. "The new name gave us a task to live up to," one administrator explained. Also, during the new president's term, the previously all black school began admitting whites for the first time.

The switch from a teacher preparation to a more general curriculum has, reportedly, broadened the opportunities of the school's graduates for finding jobs. The school had a 90% placement rate last year. This figure is important to ECSU students, who come to the school largely to escape poverty by preparing for a well-paying job. That "well-paying job" is still most often in teaching, but the number of graduates who go into teaching is declining each year. Lenient admissions policies and a comprehensive financial aids plan (which allows 80% of the student body to receive financial assistance of some kind) make the school particularly attractive to lower-class and "low-achievement" students.

ECSU is justifiably proud that, although the quality of entrants as measured by pre-admissions tests has been declining, the quality of graduates is getting higher. This may be attributed to the flexible and loosely structured curriculum which the President helped introduce, to the reduction of the student-faculty ratio through the hiring of some 25 additional faculty, and to the many faculty improvement programs at ECSU.

Morale, which was very low before the current President's administration, has climbed to a high level because of these changes, and especially because of the sharing of responsibilities for decision-making. As one of his first acts, the President placed faculty and students on every major university committee. "There is general consent that decision-making is widely shared. This belief is so prevalent that everyone interviewed listed either himself or someone in his immediate orbit as among the three most powerful people on campus," one interviewer concluded. Winning athletic teams and an award-winning band and choir have also contributed to the good feelings now found on campus, as did the self-study which the school conducted in 1969 to prepare for accreditation team visits. The study "gave many people the opportunity to examine themselves and their role within a wider context," according to one faculty respondent.

During the current President's administration, the college has received only $100,000 annually from government sources, but it now averages over $500,000. The institution has been so successful in securing these funds that it has recently had to hire a full-time federal funds director whose salary is paid by federal (Title III) funds. Title III funds were listed at just over $100,000 for fiscal year 1970. Many Title III programs are well known on campus and are regarded as central to the redirection of the university.

Early Title III appropriations from 1966 to 1968 were directed primarily toward the areas of administrative and faculty development. Administrative development was accomplished primarily through allowing administrators to attend conferences and through the liberal use of consultant services. A development office was established with Title III funds, and permanent administrators were hired to relieve faculty members of administrative duties. In conferences, formal theoretical training was supplemented with the practical anecdotal examples of experienced administrators. Largely as a result of these conferences and of the consultant visits, much progress was made in dividing responsibility and in developing institutional goals, according to one administrator.

In the last four years, 20% of the faculty has received doctorate degrees, bringing the total number of university faculty with Ph.D.'s to nearly 40%. This increase is altogether due to Title III faculty development grants. Further faculty development has been provided through short-term workshop training in specialized areas and through the "added expertise coming in through the NTF and Visiting Scholars programs." The only facet of the faculty development efforts which apparently failed at ECSU was the Professors Emeriti program. "Improvements are needed in revamping the Professors Emeriti program, the President said. "Our professors emeriti have been out of touch with today's students."

Curriculum change has occurred primarily through the mediation of the "Five College Consortium" (5 C's), of which ECSU is a participating member. The major emphasis has been on developing and implementing a guided program for freshmen. The program has been quite controversial. Several respondents lauded it as the most successful Title III program on campus, while others complained that the 5 C's program led to "intimidation of and threats against the faculty" which resulted in "a sense of insecurity" and which "lowered faculty morale." An unsuccessful petition drive to change the 5 C's program was evidently started as an effort to register these complaints more convincingly. No specifics were given in the interviews as to how the program led to this intimidation and insecurity; the only hint came in one administrator's assessment that "most like the 5 C's program, but some think it interferes with regular programs."

Another criticism, but a milder one, was registered by the President. He felt that instead of developing the same programs at each college, the consortium should develop specialized programs at each and then institute student and faculty exchanges so that these specialized strengths could be shared by all the consortium schools. Otherwise, the 5 C's curriculum won high praise for improving the freshman retention rate, for providing a "flexible, loosely structured program based on student needs," and for improving teaching methods. Again, the exact nature of the curriculum changes which were enacted through the 5 C's program was not specified. The consortium has also organized workshops for business managers and student personnel directors.

One of the more successful Title III programs at ECSU has been the "Special Services for the Disadvantaged" which gives 75 students intensive remedial and counselling assistance with specially trained personnel. In explaining the success of the program, respondents point out that past participants in the program have achieved higher grade-point averages than non-participants. This program is now largely operated with funds from federal programs other than Title III. Counseling is provided by a staff of three professional counselors and by departmental advisors who handle academic matters. The need for some improvement in the counseling staff was noted by several respondents. One suggested that a counselor with psychiatric competency be hired, and another criticized the present counselors for their "poor personalities" and lack of degrees.

One feels that if the counseling staff really needs new personnel or a new organizational structure, the changes will be made before long.

As one respondent put it, "The whole physical, academic, and administrative staff has been transformed over the last few years. The school is like a new institution." Title III programs, as noted, are highly visible on the new campus and are playing a major role in assisting the university to become increasingly "newer."

Johnson C. Smith University

(Charlotte, North Carolina)

Johnson C. Smith University is a good example of a black institution on its way to joining the mainstream of American higher education without losing its identity as a black institution. As in other such cases, strong leadership seems to be the single most important factor in this transition.

When the current president assumed the presidency of Johnson C. Smith University a few years ago, he inherited an institution which had the traditional characteristics of a private black college: students came primarily from middle class families and entered college with the vocational goal of training to become teachers and ministers. The school was badly in debt, and it had a very difficult time raising money in the city of Charlotte. Neighboring colleges did not consider Johnson C. Smith to be on a level similar to their own. Beyond training teachers and preachers to serve the black community, the college was not really involved in community affairs.

The President, a sociologist, initiated various far-reaching reforms. He was able to steer the college out of its academic and social isolation. Johnson C. Smith is now a member of three different consortia, in which it participates actively. The new President embarked on a highly successful fund-raising campaign by making the institution visible to the people of Charlotte. Pledges from local citizens to the institution now total about $2,000,000; half of this amount was pledged by whites. The school's initial debt of $2,500,000 has been reduced to $1,000,000 within one and a half years.

The changes which have occurred within the institution have been just as impressive. The new President changed the patriarchal style of leadership of his predecessor to one which delegates a certain amount of authority to make and implement decisions to all other groups on campus. An elaborate and apparently workable committee structure involves administrators, faculty, and students in decision-making in a variety of areas. This is not to say, however, that decision-making is really democratic--the President is seen by all groups on campus as the undisputed leader.

Under the new President's leadership, important changes in administration, faculty, and student body took place. For a college of its size, Johnson C. Smith now has a competent administration with a sensible number of professionals whose responsibilities are well defined. The President is assisted by two vice presidents, one for financial affairs and one for academic affairs. The faculty has been upgraded; a good number of positions formerly held by faculty past the mandatory retirement age were subsequently filled by younger teachers, whose academic qualifications are considerably better than those of their predecessors. The student body is now less homogeneous, since the college is making a successful effort to attract lower-class students with academic deficiencies.

It is in the area of curriculum changes, however, that Johnson C. Smith has made the most far-reaching changes. Preparation for the ministry and teacher education have been de-emphasized (especially ministry preparation). Rather than preparing students for these two traditional fields, the college is now trying to emphasize preparation for graduate and professional studies (an increasing number of Johnson C. Smith graduates go on to law school) as well as such marketable undergraduate programs as business administration, social work, and early childhood education. The school seems to have no difficulties in placing its graduates; business administration graduates are hired by the most prestigious firms in the Charlotte area.

One interesting example of changes in decision-making is in the area of student affairs. Disciplinary cases were in the past the domain of a faculty disciplinary committee. The same matters are now handled by a student court whose legitimacy is acknowledged by all groups on campus.

Under the auspices of the main consortium to which Johnson C. Smith belongs (the other members of this consortium are Lane, Barber-Scotia, and Livingstone Colleges), Title III funds have been used for a wide variety of purposes. By far the most important program initiated by the consortium is the College Education Achievement Project (CEAP) under which entering students with academic deficiencies receive remedial education. The consensus on the Johnson C. Smith campus seems to be that this program has been very successful.

The College Placement Service is another successful consortium activity financed by Title III funds. It is because of this program that Johnson C. Smith graduates have no difficulty in finding jobs after their graduation. Some critics of the college's placement program seem to feel, however, that the institution should do more in the area of placing students who have to earn their way through college. It has been suggested by several people on campus that the college should offer training in such marketable skills as typing to all students who are forced to earn their way through college.

Counseling is another area in which the college has made much progress. Many respondents on campus stress, however, that much more remains to be done to make counseling a really effective tool in helping students succeed. It is felt that there is still a scarcity of professionally trained counselors.

Participating in consortium activities has had some beneficial unanticipated consequences for Johnson C. Smith University. The anticipated consequences--sharing information and working on joint programs in the areas of curriculum improvement, planning, student affairs, etc.--were helpful, but the unanticipated consequence--gaining the respect of white institutions--will be even more important in the long run.

As was mentioned earlier, Johnson C. Smith is definitely on its way to joining the mainstream of American higher education. But it still faces some major obstacles in "making it":

(a) Although fund raising is handled in a vigorous manner, the college is still far from solvency. Title III funds will be of crucial importance in helping the institution achieve this goal.

(b) As a result of the college's financial difficulties, salary scales for faculty are not sufficiently competitive to attract really first-rate talent.

(c) Again as a result of lack of means, the existing inadequate physical facilities can not be improved and expanded.

(d) While CEAP has been a success, the means to really cater to student needs in the most efficient manner are lacking; staff and facilities need improvement.

(e) The one deficient area in the administration is plant operation.

Despite these shortcomings, administration and faculty are spending much energy on improving the situation, and success seems certain in the light of recent achievements if the institution can continue to benefit from Title III funds.

Livingstone College

(Salisbury, North Carolina)

A Title III consultant at Livingstone College (an institution established by black clergymen in 1879) presented the idea of a symphony orchestra which would involve the two colleges in Salisbury, and the community as well. The new orchestra has not only contributed to the cultural life of the schools and community but has also helped in coordinating the efforts of a black college and a white college in a southern town. Students and faculty from both Livingstone and Catawba Colleges, as well as students from the public schools, attend the concerts, which are held at the Community Center located on the Catawba campus.

The joint efforts of Livingstone and Catawba go further than their success with the symphony orchestra. Because of Title III support, the two colleges are able to share eight joint employees. Both Presidents sign these employees' contracts and pay one-half of their salaries. One of these joint employees, a sociology professor and an alumnus of Catawba, was delighted to tell of his joint teaching experience. Originally, each school had a one-man department of sociology. With help from the North Carolina fund ($10,000) and Livingstone's portion of Title VII, one professor and three instructors in social work were hired. Now there is a nine-man department which serves both schools and which exposes students to a much wider variety of teachers. These teachers function within their specializations.

Teaching 15 of the 16 basic courses which are held to be the minimal number for a major in sociology, the instructors consider their department to be the second best in the state, second only to the University of North Carolina. Their students compete easily with those from other colleges. Social welfare and gerontology programs have evolved during the expansion of this department.

The same sociology professor felt that Title III had made possible two unique features: (1) two small colleges were able to economize and offer improved instruction because of the joint hiring of teachers, and (2) a by-product of the program was the improvement of race relations between a black and a white college in the South.

Much emphasis has been put on the consortium of six black schools. The cooperation has resulted in the reorganization of curriculum, making it more relevant to the needs of the students. The "black experience" has been incorporated into history, literature, music, and drama. Title III money was provided for released time to allow faculty members to develop materials, attend meetings, and set up speaker programs. A first-class concert choir has evolved from the consortium arrangement. The choir is lauded on their tours and, whenever possible, alumni house and entertain them. According to the chairman of the music department, Livingstone College has benefited from the arrangement by receiving new audio-visual equipment, a multiple listening center, and film strips. These have made the music department an important service department for the entire campus and community.

The Office of Testing and Counseling has also resulted from the consortium. Its programs deal with personal, academic, social, and vocational counseling, and special counseling for married students. The facilities have been widely used. Apparently the college placement services have been successful as well.

The President compared the composition of the student body today with the student body ten years ago. Before integration of the colleges, Livingstone was attracting the top 20% of the black students. Now they have lost many of these students to white colleges, and a lesser percentage of the top students apply to this school. There are more economically deprived students with lower SAT scores, and 87% of the students receive some type of financial assistance. A reading and studies skills program, funded by Title III, has been initiated to help these students. The President expressed the desire to add programs in health, environmental education, and physical education in order to prepare the underprivileged students for the many job opportunities in these fields.

The interviewers were told of Livingstone's assets by all of the respondents, who were proud of the school's reputation as a good, small college capable of producing graduates who are competitive. Several respondents named some outstanding alumni:

1. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, the first and only black president of the National Education Association. She is currently the highest-ranking black woman in the federal system, where she is director of the Women's Bureau in the U.S. Department of Labor.

2. William Trent, a member of the executive staff of Time magazine and a trustee of several major corporations.

3. Three college presidents, including the president of Livingstone, are alumni of this school.

Livingstone also has other attractions. It is a small, warm, church-related school, small enough to involve most of its students in some activity. The school tries to keep tuition, room, and board costs down to $2,000 per year in order to accomodate students of limited means.

There is some contact between faculty and students at on-campus recreational activities, such as dances and card-playing, and at occasional dinners. The President sometimes goes to dances and to the students' dining hall. The small faculty dining room permits some socializing. Some alumni sponsor monthly "socials" at the city recreational center, and the President's wife has occasional dinners and teas for faculty members. Intramural activities between faculty and students have a high participation.

Because of Title III support, 23 out of 70 members of the faculty were able to attend summer school. With this opportunity, along with the most significant salary increase in two years, it is no wonder that the morale of the faculty has been upgraded. Also, the quality and number of administrators is increasing because of Title III.

The recent alumni homecoming, which brought out the largest alumni group in the school's history, is proof that the alumni do indeed care about their alma mater. The interest is there, and it is improving. One alumnus gave $75,000 towards the construction of the Black Heritage Hall to house books, artifacts, and memorabilia. Another gave $112,000 in cash, stocks, and bonds, plus the income of his residence for 50 years. At one time, 3,000 alumni gave $92,000 (almost $31 each) for a capital gains campaign. Another special drive was successful in raising money to construct a new building in place of an old landmark which had burned. The generous contributions from various alumni may be one reason why Livingstone, which has received Title III funds each year since 1966 and which received an all-time high of $164,000 in 1968, has been receiving steadily decreasing amounts from the federal government. In 1971, the school received only $77,000 to fund its Title III programs.

The business manager submits requests to the National Institute of Health in order to receive Title III funds for the institution. The funds are kept in a separate account and are controlled by a voucher which is signed by the Title III coordinator before the business manager releases the funds. Monies are audited annually on campus; however, the auditing firm was not named.

Other Title III benefits over the years include the construction of nine new buildings on campus, the addition of thousands of volumes of the library, the new Development Office through the Moton Foundation, and opportunities for faculty to study for advanced degrees while being replaced by NTF's.

During the past few years, participation in social activities and involvement in governing committees has increased and the town and college have been brought closer together. The symphony orchestra, part of the Livingstone-Catawba joint program, and the fact that a Livingstone biology teacher is a member of the city council, and serving as mayor pro-tem, have contributed to this new relationship. Livingstone College, after completing a ten-year development program started in 1959-60, is now working on a program of recently defined goals to expand and strengthen its contribution to higher education.

Bluffton College

(Bluffton, Ohio)

Five years ago, students were not allowed to dance at Bluffton College, nor were they allowed to smoke, drive cars, or stay out after midnight. Bluffton was very closely associated with the Mennonite Church--and Jesus Christ was seen as the "integrating principle" in campus life. Nearly all the students were Mennonites, and a strict honor code was enforced both on and off campus.

Since that time, social restrictions on students have relaxed. Old priorities are gradually disappearing. The student newspaper, for instance, is now an unusual mixture of articles on "youth culture" and campus political issues, on the one hand, and traditional and religious activities on the other. The curriculum has become notably innovative and promises to become more so. The faculty is younger (the average age is only 36), and fewer than 30% of the student body now belongs to the Mennonite Church.

The major cause for these changes was the increase in enrollment following the school's acceptance of a federal grant for increased financial aids and building expansion. A successful fund-raising drive at about the same time yielded more money for financial aids. With the increase in students came a wider diversity of interests and values. Newly admitted black students, for example, opened an Afro-American Center. The school was forced to modify its philosophy for the times and for its new clientele. Thus, the "peace emphasis" of the church has been maintained (the Mennonite Church has historically been a non-violent church), but the church--and especially "church morality"--has generally receded into the background.

Bluffton is a small college with a strong commitment to providing a good liberal arts education. Cultural and expressive activities are encouraged. Most graduates go into "service-oriented" vocations--most into teaching, and a substantial number into social work and church-related work.

Along with the more diverse student body, this commitment to liberal arts education may help explain the positive attitude of the school towards structural experimentation. Bluffton was one of the first colleges to adopt the "inter-term" or "4-1-4" calendar; they did so more than four years ago. There is an increasing use of pass-fail grading, and the college emphasizes off-campus study experiences. The latter have reportedly served to "change the school's attitude towards the outside world."

At the time of the interviews, the college was in the process of deciding whether or not to undertake a sweeping new curriculum policy which would make past innovations seem nominal by comparison. The plan was suggested by a faculty and administration team which participated in the Danforth Foundation's workshop on academic reform last summer in Colorado Springs. The plan includes provisions for the change-over from the inter-term calendar to a calendar which would be made up of twelve three-and-a-half-weeks long "modules." The completion of nine of these modules would comprise a normal school year. During each module, the student would take only one class.

Other features of the plan include "individualized curriculum" and the "Living Learning Community." The former would allow student-designed courses and an "area of concentration" approach to liberal arts. The latter is an alternative education program seeking "a more integral relationship between learning and life." Faculty and students would live together in small units as they worked on a project or a series of projects. One group of eighteen is presently experimenting with this type of alternative approach.

The outcome of the vote on these proposals is not known. In any case, they were seriously debated by the college community, and nearly every administrator actively endorsed them. This in itself accurately reflects the commitment the college has to academic innovation.

In line with this commitment, decision-making at Bluffton is clearly democratic. Everyone participates--to the extent that the faculty is regarded by some as the most powerful group on campus. Similarly, many respondents expressed concern as to whether there was enough interaction and socializing between faculty, staff, and students, even though a large number of students are frequent visitors to faculty homes. "Most of us would like to see more socializing. To really mix faculty and students takes constant work and attention," one faculty member observed.

A major concern at Bluffton is the recent decline in the school's enrollment. None of the respondents was able to explain the decline, but one suggested that the proposals of the "Danforth team" were prompted by the new enrollment figures and were partially an attempt to boost enrollment through attractive programming. Apparently, the college over-extended itself in plant expansion and in other areas based on the expectation of further growth following a significant increase in enrollment four and five years ago. This, of course, makes the present mysterious decline somewhat more troublesome.

Title III funds, as handled through the Findlay College Consortium, have provided much help to Bluffton in its expansion and liberalization efforts. Interest and participation in cooperative activities predated Title III. According to one administrator, "Mutual awareness of needs led even then to periodic meetings of deans from the three schools now in the consortium."

Since Bluffton joined the consortium in 1968, Title III funds have been applied most effectively in the areas of faculty development and off-campus study. Twelve Bluffton faculty members have been released for advanced study, and all twelve are, reportedly, close to receiving their doctorates. Respondents emphasized that the program had "increased the morale of the faculty involved" and had improved the quality of teaching.

Off-campus study opportunities at Bluffton are extensive. As one faculty member put it, "Students are going to Russia, London, New York, and Appalachia in substantial numbers." Though none of these opportunities is attributable to Title III, the original Title III program allowing social welfare students to work in the Urban Center in Toledo first helped "change the college's attitude towards the outside world." Before this program, which has since been transferred to the Cleveland Urban Center, there was no off-campus study at Bluffton. The program first opened the college's eyes to the benefits of off-campus study.

Other Title III benefits that were highly praised by respondents were the services of the Assistant to the President for Planning and Institutional Research and the consortium's comparative studies of expenditures. The Administrative Assistant, whose salary is paid by Title III, was a key participant in the "Danforth Team." The comparative studies helped Bluffton "trim the fat off our budget." The consortium also has held cooperative workshops for librarians, business managers, and admissions officers, and has continued to hold "valuable" meetings for deans and other administrators for the purpose of "exchanging ideas." An apparently less successful series of televised lectures was also organized by the consortium.

An administrative assistant felt that "the significant benefits of participation in the consortium have been to enlarge the college's possibilities, to decrease its sense of isolation, to improve the quality of its ideas, and to increase the liberalization of policies." The President added that participation in the consortium had led him to "an increasing recognition that developing institutions are making a contribution to disadvantaged people."

In spite of these past benefits, there is not as much interaction between the consortium schools now as there was in the past. "In the beginning, it was felt that the consortium was our salvation; it was idealized that much," the President explained. "Now I wonder if its impact isn't waning. I support the idea of the consortium. The consortium is useful, but it doesn't solve all problems."

Perhaps the real problem is that the consortium doesn't try to solve enough of these problems because it is presently structurally limited in its ability to deal with them. There is, for instance, no consortium office or staff. As a result, many of the services which other consortium groups are able to offer are not offered by the Findlay Consortium. The President suggested that the consortium begin joint purchasing and contracting, install closed-circuit telephone lines, centralize financial aids, purchase data processing equipment,and begin offering jointly sponsored courses and other exchanges in order to increase its effectiveness. Additional funding, as well as a consortium office, would be necessary before these cooperative ventures could materialize.

If there is a choice to be made, Bluffton respondents, other than the President, would prefer that funds be directed towards strengthening the college "separately" rather than towards strengthening it "cooperatively." Several respondents felt that steps should be taken to improve the college's "weak" remedial program, to allow additional faculty to return to school for advanced study, and to provide in-service training for faculty and administrators before emphasizing additional cooperative services in Bluffton's Title III program.

In any case, if Bluffton can find a way to boost enrollment, and if it can continue its praiseworthy course of liberalization and experimentation, the school should face a relatively bright and exciting future. One of the interviewers judged that the loss of Title III funds at Bluffton would be serious "because the college would be forced to sink back into parochialism and separateness." He concluded that "Title III enables the school to actively participate in higher education." His judgment may be too severe, but it is certainly true that without Title III funds there would be no resources to allow faculty released time for graduate study and that many other useful programs would also be curtailed or restricted in scope.

Defiance College

(Defiance, Ohio)

Defiance College was one of 40 colleges that participated in the 1971 Carnegie Commission study entitled "The Invisible Colleges: A Profile of Small Colleges with Limited Resources." The title is quite descriptive of the plight of Defiance College. Its resources are limited and threatening to become even more so. Since last year's dip in enrollment, there has been a growing concern about the college's financial condition. Since tuition is high at Defiance, most of its students are comparatively wealthy. The college is finding it increasingly hard to compete for students that can afford to attend. One revealing example of the importance of the enrollment situation at Defiance is found in a written report proposing the enlargement of student development programs. "There are many good humanitarian reasons why we should have a comprehensive supportive service program for marginal students," the report suggests. "However, the simple fact that the retention of students means increased enrollment is one that we all understand."

It is illuminating to study Defiance in light of the major conclusions of the Carnegie study. The study concluded that the "invisible colleges" have a special expertise and potential for helping students because of their small size and their concern for the individual and for teaching. Defiance would certainly like to think of itself as fitting this description.

For example, the President of the college, said, "The thing we do best is to work with students one at a time. The thrust of this college is to capitalize on the fact that we are small." Nevertheless, nowhere in the interviews is there any indication that students and faculty are in the kind of close relation to one another that makes for good Individualized teaching. Student-faculty socializing, for example, is most often described as "non-existent." One reason for the formality of the relations is apparent in the college's conduct of the student interviews for this study. Two professors and one administrator sat in on the interviews with the two students, and as the interviewer noted, "their presence made for a rather inhibited interview."

Similarly, the counseling and remedial services at the school are limited. Though new methods are being developed, currently only 40 students have access to remedial classes, and there is no professional counseling staff. However, a fine tutorial and counseling program is available to help freshmen adjust academically. Such efforts are important at Defiance because the academic level of the college's clientele has declined in recent years.

One of the traditional advantages of the small, liberal arts college which Defiance has attempted to preserve is an innovative approach to curriculum scheduling and teaching. In 1967, the college adopted the "4-1-" calendar and began scheduling classes so that none would meet on Wednesdays. Faculty and students now use Wednesdays for meetings, field trips, and other special activities. The theory is, as the President explained it, that this system "offers an opportunity for groups to plan and to be innovative." There has also been an increasing use of "credit-no credit" grading and of independent study. Presently, the administration is seeking to reduce the number of majors (possibly more for budgetary reasons than for academic reform), to further develop the inter-term, to investigate a plan for using a modular approach, and to provide more opportunities for off-campus learning activities.

The Carnegie study evidently did not help staff morale at Defiance. Some faculty began to feel for the first time that they were at a "second-rate" school, and the study also added to faculty uncertainty about the financial condition of the college. In addition, faculty salaries are comparatively low and have been for some time. If the faculty is not providing personalized attention and exciting teaching as the administration believes, or at least hopes, that they are, it may be because of a disillusionment with such concepts arising out of these incidents and circumstances.

The faculty does, in fact, show at least one other sign of disillusionment. According to the administration, there are no strong faculty leaders; and, therefore, they say it is difficult to decentralize decision-making as they would like. This desire to decentralize decision-making was a consequence of the disturbances on campus following the Kent State shootings. The major effort towards this end was to have been a "constitutional convention" convened shortly after the interviews were held for the purpose of developing a new system of government for the college. Another essentially political concern is the growing militancy of the small number of black students at the college. There have recently been more vocal demands for a black studies department and for the hiring of black professors. Last year there was a black student boycott of the neighboring Lima schools, which evidently gained the support of the black students on the Defiance campus.

Through thick and thin, Defiance alumni have shown a steady loyalty to the college, as indicated by their high financial contributions last year. In addition, many alumni send their children to Defiance. Defiance is nominally affiliated with the United Church of Christ, and this fact helps in recruiting efforts. Several respondents named the biology program as one that attracted students, but most felt that students came to Defiance because they felt that "they couldn't go anywhere else that would give them as good preparation for a career." Most students still prepare for a career in teaching or business. A growing but still very small number are attending graduate and professional schools after graduating from Defiance.

According to the President, "We have learned as much from our failures with Title III as from our successes." Title III failures at Defiance appear to well outnumber the successes. Title III monies come to Defiance in almost every case through consortium programs. This "Ohio Four" consortium seems to have outlived its usefulness. There are many at Defiance who would rather say that it was never useful. One administrator, for example, said "Defiance has benefitted because of Title III funds, not because of its involvement in the consortium." More typical is another administrator's evaluation that the consortium "started out as a grand idea, but it fizzled out."

Initially, the long-range consortium plan was to create out of the four schools one college on three campuses. Efforts in this direction were stymied early in the consortium's history. At the present time, even far more modest cooperative efforts are difficult to sustain. Apparently the basic problem is two-fold. First, each of the consortium colleges really wants to remain small; and secondly, each is in competition with the others for students and money. Under these conditions, cooperation is most difficult to promote, even though minor cooperation might be necessary to insure survival at some of the more financially insecure schools, like Defiance. One administrator described a consortium meeting in this way: "I know there is little benefit from consortium cooperation because when we student personnel people get together, we don't work on programs or planning; all we do is socialize and talk about specific campus problems." Consortium organizers now limit their talk to methods of developing joint purchasing and recruiting procedures. However, there is great resistance even here, since every instance of cooperation is seen in some quarters as a threat to campus autonomy. All involved agreed that neither of these two programs is possible "at the current level of consortium cooperation."

There have been some consortium-developed activities that have been more or less successful. Each month consortium Presidents meet to implement "athletic and faculty exchanges." An earlier student exchange program, however, failed completely because of student apathy. There are also seminars in "computer management techniques," business management techniques, and faculty development which are generally conducted by consultants. One respondent said the consortium had centralized computer registration and business activities, but in light of other responses, this seems rather unlikely.

Of the three most successful Title III programs, two are oriented entirely towards the Defiance campus. Title III pays the salary of the assistant to the President in charge of coordinating Title III programs and institutional research. This individual's greatest contribution has possibly been in the research he conducted on enrollment prospects. At least one faculty member (and probably several more) has been able to return to school for advanced graduate study through the help of Title III. The most successful consortium-sponsored activity (by default, if for no other reason) has been the Urban Center Program which allows Defiance social science majors to work in the Cleveland Urban Center. One administrator commented that the program "seems to be working well"--high praise indeed for a consortium-sponsored program.

As a result of the virtual absence of consortium cooperation, it would probably be wise policy to direct available Title III funds to purely institutional concerns, or, alternatively, towards the development of a better consortium group for Defiance College. Title III, too, must learn from its failures, and the "Ohio Four" consortium appears to be one of them.

Findlay College
(Findlay, Ohio)

Findlay College has traditionally served "first generation" college students from non-professional families, such as the families of factory foremen. About one-third of the students attend Findlay in order to pursue vocational goals in teaching, accounting, business management, and pre-ministry. The school's small size, its friendly atmosphere, and the individual attention (teaching is more important than research) are other reasons why students come to Findlay.

Title III funds have provided college services and opportunities not previously available at Findlay. From 1966 to 1970, Findlay served as the coordinating institution of the consortium of four Ohio colleges. The top personnel from each college have regular meetings which open up communications. Because faculty members want to develop relationships with members of their profession and with the larger educational community, the faculty study group was organized to create contacts between faculty of similar disciplines. The consortium's four (curricular) division chairmen met once a month during the school year and also worked cooperatively on summer school schedules. They encouraged the exchange of students where courses were offered at different institutions. The consortium published a work entitled State Laws and Regulations Governing Teacher Education and Certification. In 1970-1971, a Spanish-American program sponsored by the consortium was held on Saturday mornings. It was designed to give Chicanos a knowledge of their culture and a feeling of belonging to the community. Approximately 40 to 50 people attended these programs, which also involved the Speech and Psychology departments. The consortium also conducted a study of athletic costs which helped revise the conference rules and formed a new conference. One highly effective, non-Title III area affected by the cooperative relationship through the consortium is the Co-Op Admissions Recruiting Program.

With the onset of the present financial cutback, several respondents want the consortium to set up a central office with an administrator. Then it would be possible to include about six more schools and, thereby, to gain much strength, e.g., by expediting financial arrangements. Another respondent was opposed to the idea of a central office because there would not be enough work to do.

As a result of the curriculum study and revision program funded by Title III, the General Education program was dropped in favor of the Liberal Studies program. The latter was created by the faculty members who had been granted released time by NTF's. Also, an overseas cooperative program has been initiated.

Besides curriculum development, the faculty development programs have been most beneficial to Findlay College, not only in terms of upgrading the faculty academically, but by improving the morale of faculty as well. Faculty members were given tuition grants and released time from school in order to continue with their graduate work. The Visiting Scholars Program, which was in operation for only one year (1967-68) has been missed, and respondents hoped the program would be revived. In-service training was also funded by Title III.

The salary for the director of planning and research, who is also the assistant to the President, was paid by Title III. In the institutional research program, studies were done on analyses of faculty load, class load, and teaching effectiveness. In the admissions office, a study of in-coming freshmen was made, and in the registrar's office (with the help of computer programming) there is an information retrieval system for students currently enrolled in the school. The information is based upon 50 variables, and the respondents stated that the data was available for decision-making. The ideas and knowledge that Findlay College has gained through institutional research are now being shared with others in the consortium.

Although steps have been taken to improve the present curriculum, many suggestions were made for further improvements. For example, the students need the opportunity to take part in off-campus learning experiences. The education department is presently working with the Urban Center Project, where prospective teachers can "student teach" in Toledo. One respondent suggested having freshmen participate and work in a school system to determine whether or not they are truly interested in teaching. The psychology students intern in the state hospital mental health clinic and the children's aid society. This program could be greatly expanded; there is a real need for meaningful education such as the intern experiences.

With the increased number of minority students, a compensatory education center for underprepared students is needed. Such a center (and also a reading specialist) could be shared by the consortium members. Remedial work is limited to the Summer Foundation Program for underprepared students, but a year-round program is needed. Academic counseling also seems to be deficient.

As already mentioned, Title III has upgraded the faculty. However, there were many requests for additional workshops to maintain the emphasis upon the quality of teaching. They want more Ph.D.'s and more inter-institutional meetings. The faculty seems to be younger and better prepared than before and they have become more aware of the resources of the University of Toledo.

Title III monies, which came this year from Defiance College, which is the coordinating institution, arrive promptly and without difficulty. However, the business manager strongly recommends that the monies be paid by the government on a regular, periodic basis instead of by cash request. He has some problems with left-over money since he will not return it without specific, written authorization from Washington. He does not write any checks unless he has the authorizing papers. On campus, monies are released upon receipt by the business office of properly authorized requests originating from the campus coordinator's office. Federal authorities were at Findlay College in February, 1971, and OK'd the accounting. The books are audited on an annual basis. The business manager is a C.P.A. and is cautious in insuring that all details are followed.

Since the current president took office in 1964, dramatic changes have taken place. In 1962 Findlay received North Central accreditation, only to lose it and be put on probation the next year because of problems with students and faculty. After the new President took office, the college began a self-evaluation study. In 1965, the probation was lifted and the institution was put on a new schedule. Finally, accreditation was regained in 1968. The faculty and administrators have been highly satisfied with the President. In fact, faculty morale is low because the President will be leaving this year, and because tenure (a critical issue) will be up for discussion. There is not a defeatist attitude among the staff, but an uncertainty about questions of student enrollment and University leadership.

Under the present form of campus governance, administrative decisions are made through consultation with individual members of the staff. The President initiates conferences and brings about the resolution of differences. There is no administrative council, and there are no regularly scheduled meetings of top administrators. A Long-Range Planning Committee, which consists of faculty, students, administrators, board members, and alumni, establishes guidelines for decision-making. Faculty members are involved in academic decisions, and students control the social issues, such as co-ed living and student rights and responsibilities.

Title III has definitely had a positive impact upon faculty morale and pride in the institution at Findlay. A little bit of money has gone a long way. There is no doubt that the programs have been viewed as a part of the fabric of the institution. A loss of funds would drastically hurt the college, as the programs would have to be dropped or reduced to minimal levels. Consortium members appear to be interested in a long-range continuation of the cooperative arrangement, so that, if permitted to, they would be selective in choosing programs which would yield the greatest results.

Wilberforce University

(Wilberforce, Ohio)

One of the two interviewers described Wilberforce as "probably the most 'developing' college I've visited." After studying the programs initiated at Wilberforce with the Title III funds they have been receiving since 1966, one does not wonder for long how he came to this conclusion.

The most dynamic and hopeful of all the programs (called "the core and soul of Title III programs" by one administrator) was the NTF program, which helped two faculty members to obtain Ph.D.'s and others to obtain Master's degrees. Unfortunately, this program was phased out after two years. Many respondents feel that there should be a permanent fund to help finance faculty development. Wilberforce wants to increase the proportion of faculty members with Ph.D.'s from 33% to 40%.

In the Cooperative Education Program, students are trained to go out into the world of work. The program is expensive but valuable to the students and to the institution. Wilberforce initially received a grant from the Ford Foundation, and Title III supported the program. Later it was taken out of Title III by the Cooperative Education Grants from the Office of Education. This program was developed originally by Antioch and was adapted to meet special problems of black students.

Wilberforce works closely with Antioch College through the Wilmington-Antioch-Wilberforce Consortium. Through Antioch, the college receives assistance in educational theory, practice, and evaluation. Apparently Antioch is called upon to help solve internal problems of Wilberforce, such as staffing problems. In 1970, Wilmington worked cooperatively with Wilberforce on an Urban Studies Program and, with Central State, Wilberforce was involved in a Title III program in physics and data processing. This was eventually dropped because of lack of funds. Wilberforce is also a member of the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium Program (12 Colleges). The school's President is currently serving as chairman of the executive council of this consortium.

Other programs have been supported by Title III and then phased out. The remedial program, which had received federal monies for four to five years, was one of these. Also, the Cultural Enrichment Program, which included off-campus programs, trips, and tours, was phased out as a Title III program but has been continued in the school's own budget.

The head librarian listed salaries, supplies, and equipment as Title III benefits, and she believes that it is impossible to operate without federal funds.

Great emphasis has been placed on curriculum development, and the revision of the general education program (1965) received favorable student responses. Also, the areas of business and natural science, in addition to teacher education and social sciences, have been strengthened.

Institutional research, one respondent claims, has enabled Wilberforce to plan for the future in its projected building programs. Wilberforce moved to a new campus in the early 1960s, and so far the new facilities include two dormitories, one cafeteria and student center, a classroom-science building, and a faculty apartment unit. The new campus was planned to provide adequate facilities for 1,200 on-campus students with an additional 600 students on cooperative education jobs.

Title III is helping Wilberforce move much faster and farther than the majority of small colleges in the country. The students come to the school because it is a small, black, liberal arts institution that provides the vocational training they are looking for. If Title III funds were terminated, these students would be affected by the cutbacks, although an effort to continue consortia involvements would be made.

HEW distributes the federal coordinator monies. Then the Title III coordinator prepares the budget from faculty requests which individual faculty members submit to him. Requests are reviewed by the coordinator, business manager, and the President; and the monies are distributed on the campus by the Title III coordinator. The financial procedure operates on a letter-of-credit arrangement with a local bank. At the beginning of every month, an estimate is made of how much Title III money will be needed; then that amount is drawn from this bank. This money is used during the month to pay individual bills.

There is a central accounting system. Title III funds can be accounted for specifically, and monies are kept on separate ledger cards for each program. Audits have been made twice at Wilberforce, once by private auditors and once by federal auditors.

Accreditation by the North Central Association in 1962 marked a giant step forward for the university. There has been a tremendous growth in its student body from 415 in 1964 to 1,300 in 1971. There has been an increase in awareness and in the political and academic sophistication of the student body--i.e., students demand more from their instructors in terms of quality education.

Although Wilberforce is developing and improving, the respondents did not hesitate to point out additional changes and improvements that they wanted. A more comprehensive counseling program is needed, and Wilberforce is attempting to recruit two counselors in response to a student council demand. One respondent would like to see the consortium form a graduate school. Others would like to see the financial deficit eliminated, the new campus completed, a new library, a critical evaluation of grading standards, and more professional administrators.

The cry for more professional administrators hints of the presence of internal dissatisfaction. Although the President has been attributed with being the driving force for many of the changes at Wilberforce, members of his staff have been labeled as being poor administrators The respondents aired feelings describing relationships among faculty, administrators, and students on campus. The student group complained that the white administrators--i.e., the Academic Dean and the Business Manager--had more power than anyone else, and they felt there was little student input in the organized channels of decision-making. In 1969 there was a student boycott which annoyed the faculty. This incident has strained student-faculty and student-administration relationships to the point of less socializing and less student interest in the school.

The group of students interviewed may or may not be representative of the rest of the student body, but they do shed a different light on some of the programs the interviewers had previously heard about, e.g., the Cooperative Education Program. Perhaps Wilberforce should try to open _all_ channels of communication before proceeding further with other new programs. Apparently the students are still not satisfied with their role at the university. If the administrators do not take time to listen now, they could be faced with much more complicated student-relations problems later.

Oklahoma Christian College

(Oklahoma City, Oklahoma)

After completing his work at Oklahoma Christian College (OCC), one interviewer wrote: "It is a paradox to this interviewer that behavior outside the academic area could be so restricted in terms of regulations and restrictions consistent with church-affiliated views, and yet that the school could be so highly concerned for faculty preparation and curriculum innovation and change inside the academic area."

OCC is strongly affiliated with the Church of Christ. Compulsory chapel is held daily. Many graduates go into the ministry, and the faculty occasionally mentions "missionary groups" as a form of faculty "socializing." Rules are strict, numerous, and inviolate. Eighteen students were promptly arrested and expelled, for example, after staging a sit-in protest in reaction to their suspension for attending an "all-night party" in 1968. According to the President, the college gained as much respect from the student body as it did from the community for its speedy response to these rule infractions.

At the same time, the faculty at OCC has moved from one "local in background and training to a more sophisticated and educated diversity" according to one faculty respondent. In the last few years, the proportion of faculty Ph.D.'s has grown from 20% to 60%. Instructors have "loosened up course structure" and "moved away from a material text approach to a behavioral objectives approach."

The curriculum has diversified in a number of ways. The entire general education program has been "revamped," and new programs and courses have been added. The commitment to academic enrichment seems as strong at OCC as the commitment to spiritual enrichment. The Learning Center, an area in which each student has his own study facilities, is an important example of this commitment, and is a source of fiscal and academic values. "Finances for . . . the Learning Center started us on the road of academic progress. We were able in this way to break from pure tradition," a faculty member explained.

The Learning Center is a symbol of an "innovative approach" which has brought increased enrollment, financial support, and recognition to OCC. One administrator boasted, "We have been named in some national publications and are recognized for our innovative approach." Respondents consistently refused to name other schools which serve as models for OCC, insisting that "OCC is the model for other schools."

One more tangible result of innovation is a large number of good students. As one interviewer wrote, "There is some evidence that students who are concerned about the religious values embraced by the school and who are also concerned about 'a fine education' have chosen this particular institution from several other similar institutions which might have been attended."

A combination of factors have led to the wide-spread community support with which OCC is blessed. The extent of this support can be roughly measured by the over $2 million collected in last year's fund-raising drive--an impressive figure for a small (1,500 enrollment) college. Not least of these factors is OCC's reputation for "academic excellence." (Another not previously mentioned is the school's traditionally fine basketball program. The team won the NAIA tournament two years ago and is a source of much pride at OCC and for OCC alumni.)

Decision-making at OCC is highly influenced by the priority of maintaining fiscal support for the school. As the President put it, "We are not autocratic, but we do have a commitment to a particular philosophy, and our ultimate responsibility is to our clientele reflected in the Board of Trustees." Although the Board expects rules and regulations to be "rigid" some innovation in the form of decentralization of social regulations can be found even here. Curriculum changes can be initiated by faculty members, for instance, and there is increasing involvement of students in administrative committees, though student involvement is still considered by some respondents to be "minimal in the development of committee decisions."

Students don't seem to mind much. They seem to respect and trust the administration and the faculty. Morale is apparently high in all quarters. The students were cheered by new facilities that have been built recently, and the faculty is still most happy about the opportunities they had had to return for graduate study through the Title III program.

These graduate study opportunities have been entirely due to Title III. Exact figures are not available, but most of the faculty have been released at some time during the last six years for advanced graduate work. This is reflected by the 40% increase in doctorate degrees. Testimonials to the effectiveness of this program are abundant. Among others, the physical education instructor boosts the program: "I have changed my teaching approaches as a result of advanced education," he reported.

The emphasis of the Title III program at OCC has changed recently from released time for graduate work to curricular development. One faculty member explained that OCC had reached "the saturation level" in faculty development. "We have retained more people, gained a stable, advanced faculty, and now are in a position to concentrate on curriculum," another faculty member added.

The exact nature of these curricular changes is difficult to ascertain at present. The Learning Center is a Title III program, and as noted, there have been changes made in teaching methods. However, the "revamped" curriculum was not described in detail by respondents. One of the few changes mentioned was the institution of a new major in home economics. Another was the development of a diagnostic writing class which "has helped in the remedial area." Nevertheless, several comments suggest that curriculum changes were not specifically listed simply because there had been too many of them to list comprehensively rather than because there had been too few to enumerate. "Before we expanded the curriculum, one faculty member explained, "the school was in its infancy with only a skeleton curriculum."

Title III is directly or indirectly responsible for most of the aforementioned faculty and curriculum development at OCC. The committed attitude of the administration towards innovation is the other key factor in OCC's development. Still, without Title III funds to allow faculty to receive advanced graduate training and to finance curriculum expansion, administrative enthusiasm alone would likely have achieved substantially less. It is difficult to say exactly what position OCC might have been in today without Title III funds. The administration is aggressive in fund-raising and might have secured the necessary funds for development anyway.

However, the financial gifts have been directed towards development of plant facilities, and it is hard to imagine that enough additional money could have been secured in fund-raising to finance the programs made possible by Title III. Even if this extra money could have been secured, it would not have been necessarily directed into similar programs.

Indeed, there is some reason to believe that the emphasis might have been somewhat more traditional because of the priorities of the Board of Trustees. As one interviewer put it, "Title III has everything to do with the shifting of functions (from religious and protective to academic) and will be indirectly responsible for the shifting of clientele if such a shift should take place."

Even assuming that OCC chooses to maintain that "paradoxical" balance between progressive academic and conservative religious approaches, and is able to do so, the institution may still have some future problems with which Title III might be helpful. Several teachers complained that teaching loads are presently too heavy. "The faculty is excellent, but it is overworked," one said. By providing funds for additional National Teaching Fellows, Title III could help reduce the teaching load and the consequently high student-faculty ratio at the same time. The additional problem of low faculty salaries is one that another successful fund-raising drive might alleviate, if institutional commitments move in that direction.

Another possible area for development at OCC through Title III is the counseling program. Most respondents felt the program "could be better." The provision of a black counselor for black students and a woman counselor for women students was suggested as a solution of the problem. The President, however, found counselors at OCC "discipline-oriented rather than counselor-oriented." This is a revealing criticism, as it suggests that changes in attitudes towards counseling may not happen until changes in the racial and sexual composition of the counseling staff occur.

Otherwise, as OCC grows stronger financially and moves further into the mainstream of higher education, Title III funds will be increasingly less necessary to the school and, as such, should be distributed to schools with greater needs. OCC is apparently gaining strength and moving further every year. At the moment, there seems to be little conflict in the religious and academic enthusiasms of the campus, and if the level of excitement can be maintained, the institution should continue to prosper.

Lincoln University

(Lincoln University, Pennsylvania)

Lincoln University, founded in 1854, is a nonsectarian, coeducational, privately controlled and state-aided four-year college of liberal arts. It is reported to be the oldest college in the United States to have as its original purpose the higher education of black youth.

The campus is part of a tract of 300 acres of farm- and woodland owned by the university. According to the interviewers' report, the physical facilities include 24 main buildings and 21 faculty residences. A gymnasium and a new library are presently under construction.

The interviewer's report of critical incidents on campus during the past few years was written so well that it will be quoted verbatim:

"The interviews with administrators, faculty, and students as well as casual conversations with these groups revealed that one of the critical incidents of some significance was the student unrest, some of which was believed to have been encouraged by a few faculty members, during the 1968-69 and the 1969-70 years. The cause for the unrest appears to have been a general concern among students for more involvement in the governance of the university. Coupled with this was a desire of students to effect a stronger commitment from the Board of Trustees and the Administration to consider changes which would take more directly into account the specific needs and characteristics of black students now enrolling in the University. Those needs included a climate and an attitude, as well as programs, which would facilitate the resolution of problems of identity both from a personal and from an institutional perspective. The unrest among students took the form of boycotts of classes and other minor acts of protest. According to reports, these actions were nonviolent and no physical damage was done to buildings or facilities.

"Respondents who were on campus during the two-year period ending in 1970 feel that the student unrest led to the resignation of the incumbent president (white) and the selection or appointment of a new president (black) whose philosophy and leadership potential would reflect the kind of concerns students were seeking.

"The current president has been in office for one year and appears to have the full respect and support of the faculty and students. We get the impression that he is much more flexible than his predecessor and more receptive to the concerns of students. It appears that the Board of Directors made an excellent choice and that the institution will grow under his leadership.

"The president of the student body was heavily involved in the protest as well as in the planning and decisions which were made to resolve the problems. As a result, he is regarded by most of the students as being a powerful figure on campus. Students are now represented on the major committees of the university, including the powerful Administrative Council, which deals with day-to-day problems at its weekly meetings.

"A second major incident in recent years was the death of a student due to excessive use of drugs. As a result of this incident, the health services area was strengthened. The services of the university physician were increased to one-half time, and a psychiatrist was employed on a part-time basis. The latter spends two full afternoons and evenings on campus and is on call around-the-clock in the event his services are needed beyond his scheduled days on campus. The student personnel and counseling areas are now more alert to detecting symptoms or signs which may suggest that the student needs the attention of the medical staff. It was apparent that the personnel staff was making every effort to avoid a recurrence of this incident.

"In summary, the interviewers identified two critical incidents which occurred at Lincoln University during the last three years. One of them was definitely associated with or influenced a major change in the administrative structure of the institution--the appointment of a new president. The other resulted in major changes in provision for meeting the psychological and other health needs of students."

Part of the $279,000 Title III funds received in 1971 (a reduction from $344,000 in 1970) was used successfully for the Lincoln-Princeton Project. This is a bilateral arrangement through which certain students' services, curriculum planning, faculty development, consulting services, and visiting faculty are provided to Lincoln's programs. The respondents stated that if Title III monies were terminated, all of the services available through the joint program would be reduced.

The Professor of Religion, who received his Th.D. from Princeton, spent a year there with support from Title III. His general impression was that Princeton was not helpful in assisting him in devising innovations to use back at Lincoln. He suggested that "developed institutions" needed a better understanding of problems back home in order to be of maximum effectiveness in assisting in planning and developing programs for implementation in developing institutions. He suggested that developed institutions should get a better orientation of the problems and prospects of "developing" institutions. Nevertheless, the professor was able to accomplish a great deal in the way of program planning during the leave-of-absence supported by Title III funds.

Another faculty member was better acquainted with the 13 College Curriculum Program, known as 13-CC to students, who were unaware of its affiliation with Title III. The respondent contrasted 13-CC with the traditional program in biology in terms of class size. The regular program has 150 students in lecture and 40 in laboratory sections, whereas under the 13-CC program there are 50 in lecture and 25 in lab sections. The small classes permit more student participation and a better opportunity for faculty members to get to know the students. The two student respondents participated in the 13-CC program for two years but they were not involved as seniors because the program does not include their classes. Both of these students stated that they chose to come to Lincoln because it is a black university with a good location and reputation, and that there was some influence from peers and parents. Apparently the white students come because of quality of the program, economy, and convenience.

The Dean of Students, along with his staff, handles the major responsibility for counseling on personal problems. In the tutorial program, "trouble shooters" or specialists are available to identify and diagnose students' problems of identity and academic deficiencies. The Dean mentioned the Student Support Services which help academically disadvantaged students individually through a number of services outside of the classroom. A cut in Title III funds would have a drastic effect because the students would have to go through group procedures in dealing with their academic deficiencies.

Other Title III programs mentioned once were the Cooperative College Development Program, the recruitment of ghetto faculty, and NTF's. One administrator complained that they were late in being informed of the grant amount for the fiscal year so that there was too much last-minute recruiting for NTF's. They need at least six to eight months to plan for the next year.

In his 22 years at Lincoln, the Professor of Religion has seen many changes, including the growth of the physical plant and an increased enrollment. The composition of the student body has changed from all black to a mixed group due to integration during the 60s. There are also more highly trained and younger faculty members. In the last five years the type of student at Lincoln has changed, and some women have also been admitted.

Some respondents pointed out that faculty morale was increased by programs of faculty development, though other respondents (including one faculty member) felt that morale had dropped because of the failure to get pay raises in 1971. Though the latter was disturbing, it did not affect the teaching performance of the teachers. There are several fringe benefits that compensate for the salary situation, e.g., campus housing for faculty which is economical in comparison to the cost of living in Philadelphia and commuting 45 miles each morning.

With a small (1971) student body of 1066, and 108 faculty members, there appears to be considerable interaction between the students and faculty. One senior student mentioned that planning for cultural programs and attending those activities made for a good deal of contact between faculty and students. She was referring to the Black Arts Festival, which was an eight-day cultural program featuring a lecture and slide presentation about blacks in early American art, concerts by jazz and choral groups on campus, an African=American dinner, an African ritual, an African market, performances by dance and theater groups, a talent show, and a soccer game.

There was no mention of the relationship between the black and white students on campus, but the President did feel that the relationship between black and white faculty could be improved.

Lincoln University is not part of a consortium, but it receives Title III monies by way of a letter of credit from a funding agency. Proportionate allocation of the money to the several projects is then determined by the Administrative Council, which consists of administrators, faculty, and students. A private accounting firm audits the money, and no internal audit is made.

Lincoln University has used its Title III monies to become a "developing" institution through the Lincoln-Princeton Project, the 13 College Curriculum Program, Student Support Services, and NTF's. Although they complain about a few inadequacies of the program and about a lack of funds, they are indeed appreciative of the program and their progress thus far.

Benedict College

(Columbia, South Carolina)

Benedict College has been called "a showcase of what can happen as a result of Title III's efforts to bring schools with potential into the educational mainstream." Much of the credit for the school's progress can be attributed to the President, who is an excellent recruiter of personnel and administrators who work as a team.

One of the earliest Title III programs was the joint Freshman Program with Allan University, which lasted for two years. Attention was given to joint curriculum study, methods of teaching, and the preparation of course outlines. The aid of three consultants was made available.

Presently the most popular and exciting Title III initiated program is the College Education Achievement Project (CEAP) started in 1967. One hundred students, who have high academic potential but who would normally be denied college admission because of their test scores and inadequate high school preparation, are admitted to Benedict and take part in this experiment in compensatory education. The traditional classes are replaced with a series of laboratories on writing, reaction to ideas, speaking and listening, reading, and math. Individualized instruction is emphasized. No textbooks are used, and the students are required to keep up with current events through newspapers, radio, and television. Psychological support, as well as academic training is included in the program, and a high percentage of the students are able to make it through the program. The first CEAP graduates from

Benedict last year were able to do well in college, and some of them graduated with honors. After two years of Title III funding, the program is now sponsored by the Southern Association of Colleges (a consortium of 13 schools).

In other areas of curriculum development, a basic studies program grew out of the success with CEAP. In the area of physical science, a cooperative program with Columbia College was funded by Title III. The Director of the Community Development Institute, which is an interdisciplinary social science course established by Title III, has big plans for his new program.

Faculty development programs have been helpful because they have helped "retool" teachers for the acceptance of teaching innovations. For example, workshops for the teachers are particularly valuable in helping to understand the needs of students in CEAP.

In the area of faculty development, the Triangle Association of Colleges, consisting of five private black colleges in South Carolina and Paine College in Augusta, Georgia, has been a useful consortium to Benedict. The quality of the faculty has been improved by the master's teaching program, in which six outstanding black scholars were shared among these schools. Because the Triangle initially received $100,000 from the Ford Foundation, the Joint Lyceum Program, now supported by Title III, has developed.

The placement office and the development office have been labeled "the core of the Title III programs." Both offices were established in 1970 through the Moton Development Consortium. In addition to the placement office, a new Director of Placement has provided the students with excellent service. The Director of Career Counseling and Placement has stated that he plans to visit high schools and to get acquainted with the community and the areas of job needs.

Title III was also extended to administrative improvement by strengthening and developing the skills of officers of administration.

Title III funds are requested via NIH, and the funds are put into current restricted funds. Only when an expenditure is made does Benedict recognize restricted funds as income. The monies are allotted on campus on the basis of a line item budget from Title III, and every six months the monies are audited by an independent auditing firm. If Title III funds were terminated, programs would be seriously curtailed but not entirely lost. Many improvements have been "built in."

Benedict certainly seems to be "going somewhere," one respondent stated. The changes over the past five years have heightened the institution's attractions. For example, the specialization of the administration, the upgraded faculty with an increase of Ph.D.'s from 19% to 42%, the increase of the student body from 1004 to 1500, and the increased number of majors offered (from 10 to 21) have encouraged students to take advantage of the financial aid program and to get an education at Benedict College. The school, which has an open admissions policy, has helped students to prepare for jobs in the fields of teaching, economics, medicine, law, social work, and civil service and thus raise their economic status. Since the school is no longer Baptist-controlled, only a few graduates enter the ministry.

One respondent indicated that everyone seems well pleased with the "temper of the times." The administrators and faculty spend long hours at their work. The alumni have increased their gifts, and students are responding positively via negotiations rather than via confrontations. The students, who seem to be pleased to be members of what they consider to be the best black college in the area, outnumber the faculty members five to four on the Residence Hall Judiciary Committee. Ideal though this may appear, the student government president complained that, although the students had the majority vote, some faculty members were so verbose and persuasive that usually the final decision was taken out of the students' hands and went the way the faculty members wanted it to go. But the students, who are on all faculty committees, can be proud of their victory in initiating the vote that led to the abolishment of the English Comprehensive Exams. In this instance, they were supported by the faculty. The administrators and their committees are responsible for decisions in their areas of responsibility, and the Trustee Committee meets with both students and faculty.

Several suggestions for improvements of Benedict involve Title III. The students would like to have a human relations center on campus for individualized instruction which would include a learning machine, video tapes, and microfilm. An administrator would like to see the entire institutional program individualized along with the Triangle Association, which would have an impact on the other five member colleges. The school is moving rapidly beyond a mere consortium arrangement. In order to insure the continued success of the development of Benedict, finance and consultation are needed to develop long range planning.

Besides being proud of the many innovative steps this school has taken with the help of Title III, Benedict can boast that it is one of only four private colleges in South Carolina that is eligible to receive state aid, by a decree from the Supreme Court.

Lander College

(Greenwood, South Carolina)

Lander College is unique in its status as the only county-owned, four-year college in the country. Previously a private Methodist women's teacher preparation college, Lander was taken over by Greenwood County ten years ago at the behest of a now-retired president. At that time the college also became coeducational. Fifty percent of Lander students are from the county, and more than 95% are from the four-county area surrounding the college.

The last great series of changes at Lander has been effected since the 1967 appointment of a new President. Since that time, enrollment has doubled from 500 to 1,000, and the budget has tripled to nearly $2,000,000 annually. Reorganization seems to be the theme of the new President's administration. The administrative structure has been decentralized, with an emphasis on teamwork. The curriculum has been extensively reorganized. Some courses have been eliminated, while non-teaching and technical programs have been added. There are now fewer required courses, more options, and more individualized majors. The faculty has been upgraded through the hiring of young instructors and by allowing older teachers to return to school for advanced degrees and more training. Academic departments have been consolidated so that there are now seven departments where there were once 28.

Some of these changes have not been particularly popular. In order to upgrade the faculty, the administration has adopted a "forced retirement" policy which has caused teachers of age 65 and over to be dropped from the faculty. "The discharge of one of our speech and drama instructors was a major incident as far as I'm concerned," the chairman of the drama department said. "The man had a considerable following among students and in the community. There was considerable confusion and resentment, and there was some unsuccessful community pressure directed towards trying to get him rehired." Faculty were also critical of the reduction of the number of department heads, feeling that this reduced faculty influence, which had already been quite low.

Students were no less critical--but they were critical for a different reason. According to one of the interviewers, "Students regarded the president with considerable distaste, feeling that he was making all the decisions and that their being on various committees was just a sham to cover up the real power of the President. They did not disapprove of the changes attributed to him, but complained that he made them without first consulting them. They said there was a credibility gap at Lander between the President and the students . . . most said they would not have enrolled at Lander if they knew what they know now."

It is ironic that may of those students would not even have been eligible to enroll at Lander before the President's appointment. One of his first actions was to open admissions to low-income and black students who had previously been excluded. Seventy percent of the students commute, and for these students the cost of attending Lander is quite low. Most students are still preparing for teaching careers, but their number has been reduced from 80% to 60%, while the nursing program (one of the few two-year programs at the school) has increased in popularity, as have the business and professional programs.

The growth of the college has brought much strain on the present facilities. One new building has been completed, and renovation of the other buildings is taking place; but there are severe inadequacies in the facilities used for the new technical programs. There is some talk now about having the state take over responsibility for the college from the county. This would relieve many financial worries presently troubling the college and would possibly allow for some further plant expansion. The consequences of growth have not all been detrimental, by any means. The basketball team started in 1968 and is a source of much interest in the community and on campus. A marching band was formed a year later. Many respondents felt that such activities were important for keeping a commuter school like Lander "somewhat cohesive." Cohesiveness has also been promoted through the appointment of faculty and students to administrative committees. Currently a student representative sits on the Board of Trustees.

Lander has been the recipient of substantial Title III aid. Title III funds have been used very much in accordance with the reorganizational focus of President Herd's administration. The improvement and streamlining of administration services at Lander has been noted. Much of the credit for this improvement may be attributed to the University of Georgia administrative seminars, which Lander administrators have been participating in for the last four years. The University of Georgia calls this the "Team Leadership Consortium." Aside from structural reorganization, perhaps the most important benefit of the consortium has been that it led to the development of a pension plan for the faculty. The seminars are held once a year for three to four days. Perhaps of even greater value to administrators was the Title III long-range planning grant, which enabled the school to bring in consultants to determine "efficient use of other funds." The consultants not only worked on the faculty pension fund but also on curriculum matters, in which their suggestions led to the elimination of many antiquated courses. Consultants also suggested the development of a program whereby graduates of state technical schools could enroll at Lander to obtain their Bachelor of Science degrees. According to one respondent, funding of this program is also provided by Title III. Presently there are 40 to 50 students enrolled in this program, representing thirteen state technical schools.

Faculty development through advanced study and the National Teaching Fellows program has been instrumental in upgrading the faculty. Upgrading the faculty, as we have noted, has been one of the President's principal goals. In fact, this was such an important goal that "previously there was very little choice in taking advanced training," according to one faculty respondent. "If you were selected, you had to go." Now faculty participation is voluntary and seems to be declining because of a change of emphasis to the improvement of student services. During its time, however, the program appears to have been quite comprehensive, involving perhaps a third or more of the faculty. Though it was noted that the number of teachers at Lander with doctorates has increased, there was no report on the number of new Ph.D.'s or of how many of them are attributable to Title III released time. Presumably, nearly all of them are. Title III also provided travel funds for faculty attendance at professional meetings and for exchange visits with New England College in New Hampshire.

The emphasis on improvement in student services was still in its first quarter of implementation at the time of the interviews, and consequently was difficult for respondents to evaluate. Evidently Title III funds in this area have helped in the development of a "Learning Lab" and have been used to finance a freshman tutorial program. The Learning Lab had just been installed at the time of the interviews and was being used for remedial classes in basic math, English, and chemistry. The Lab is equipped with much media equipment, including books on cassettes, a reading machine, video taping equipment, and other recording equipment. Respondents seemed quite proud of the quality of the equipment and were hopeful about the potential of the Lab. The tutorial program was thought to be important because, as one faculty respondent observed, "the change in admissions standards produced more students needing attention."

Title III is helping the young and energetic administrative team move the college "into a new era." If a true picture emerges from the interviews, the major problem for Lander administrators seems to be in communicating with faculty and students. Some faculty members seem confused and dismayed, and there is a widening "credibility gap" between the administration and at least some of the students. Title III is not directly involved in these disputes. Despite these other possible shortcomings, Lander administrators appear to have used Title III funds most intelligently, and there is no doubt that the funds have been instrumental in helping to engage Lander in a far more exciting future.

University of Corpus Christi

(Corpus Christi, Texas)

"Total institutional involvement" was the Title III project director's description of the University of Corpus Christi's involvement with Title III. The emphasis has been on curriculum development and faculty development. Student personnel and administrative procedures have also been affected.

The University of Corpus Christi has traditionally performed the functions of providing a small college setting for students in a private college with a slightly above average educational program. It has provided this kind of educational setting for students primarily from the Texas-Oklahoma area and from the East Coast. Most of these students have come from economically middle-class families, with only recent increases in the number of students from low-income families. The university is located in Corpus Christi, Texas, which has a very large Mexican-American population, but Mexican-American students and black students (blacks are the smallest minority in the community) are markedly under-represented in its clientele. The clientele is shifting, although slowly. A few more Mexican-American and black students have been admitted to the institution. Title III funds indirectly promoted the expansion of enrollment in this direction through the basic English Developmental Reading Program and through summer programs in which students participated before their formal admission in the fall of the year.

Title III funds allowed instructors to plan and implement these various curricula.

The majority of the staff and faculty agreed that accreditation by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges in 1960 was a marked turning point for the college. Under the administration of a previous president, the institution began to take action toward growth. Concern was expressed in the areas of faculty qualification, curriculum, and accreditation. The President's untimely death seemed to have jolted the campus community with the fear that they were going to cease making "progress." After a short-term, highly controversial President, the current President was elevated from the position of Academic Dean, and he has continued to press for "development." The President, while serving as Academic Dean, had written the initial Title III proposal and was deeply committed to its value to the institution.

Two aspects of development at UCC are its separation from the Southern Baptist Convention and the possibility of becoming a state college. The Texas state legislature has decided to put a senior college in Corpus Christi, as a part of the Texas A & I system, sometime in the near future. Because the University of Corpus Christi already has a campus (with the title to the property having recently been handed over by the federal government after a 20-year period during which the university improved the former Naval Air Station property), its trustees and administrators have offered it as a site for this new state college. A small handful of the faculty and staff voiced a desire to see UCC remain a private institution, though admitting that it could not afford to do so. The state's final decision on this matter, whether positive or negative, will bring many changes to the university. For example, should it be selected to become part of the Texas A & I system, it will move into a whole new area of higher education activities as a state-supported institution, with all of the contingent items--such as increased enrollment, improvement in faculty level and quality, and expanded program offerings. If, on the other hand, it is not selected as the site, and if a state senior college is nonetheless placed in Corpus Christi, then UCC will have to make changes in order to compete with the state-supported institution.

Curriculum revision, with the help of Title III funds, has provided UCC with a liberal arts curriculum that offers a single Bachelor of Arts degree. Originally, the curriculum was fragmented and highly professionalized with multi-degree programs. Special attention for the individual student has also emerged from these changes.

A large part of the faculty are aware of the Title III programs on the campus. Responses to questions of the interview show that all of the faculty members interviewed have participated in traveling to other campuses as part of the UCC Scholars Program, have attended conventions, meetings, institutes, seminars, and retreats, have worked with visiting consultants, or have been involved in programs such as the CAMPUS Program for underachievers (which involves working with freshmen for three weeks in the summer). One associate professor of speech developed courses in the areas of speech and humanities during the summer of 1971 when he was given released time, which was paid for by a stipend from Title III.

Another professor developed an experimental music class while part of his salary was being paid by Title III during released time.

Through attendance at meetings and workshops and through talking with consultants and visiting other campuses, the faculty has become better informed on up-to-date techniques of teaching. They have been able to travel and to see other programs; as a result, they have brought about curriculum change on their own campus.

An upward swing in the morale of both faculty members and of the students who participate in the Faculty-Freshmen Seminar (another Title III program) has been noticed. Groups of ten freshmen are being invited into faculty homes as a part of the program, thereby increasing the amount of formal and informal mixing between faculty and students. Because most administrators are former faculty members, there is some socializing, but it appears to be strictly by personal preference.

UCC has incorporated a tutorial program which is funded by Title III into their remedial program to help prepare disadvantaged students. There is still a need for more math and English programs to enable more students to move into the mainstream of the academic requirements of the institution. The Title III project director stated that the other federally funded programs, such as EOG, Workstudy, summer institutes, and NDSL, are linked to Title III programs by discovering ways to pull together the aid for low-income students. All five of the students interviewed indicated a desire to see the student body increase in heterogeneity. They thought the location was ideal for a multi-racial campus.

The Title III monies, which have been channeled into many productive programs, are distributed on a quarterly basis. The institution draws funds directly from its NIH assigned budget. UCC is not part of a consortium. The director of the Title III program makes requests and approves purchase orders, whereupon the business manager honors requests. The funds are audited by Alexander Grant and Company, San Antonio, Texas, and the funds are recognized as being separate from local financial resources.

Students, asked why they had come to UCC, replied that they came (1) because a friend, relative, or peer had told them about it, (2) because of its smallness, and (3) because of its location. The interviewer observed that not one of the five students identified the attraction as being related to the curriculum. Staff and faculty interviewees thought that students came to UCC because of their religious background. But one senior girl said she would not choose the college again because she had come to UCC not knowing it was Baptist, though her family was Baptist. She considered transferring but later decided to spend four years there in the elementary education program.

Besides the teaching field, many students obtain jobs in business, government work, and a wide variety of other fields. The number of students who go on to graduate school will increase, speculates one faculty member, as the institution recruits better students.

The decision-making process seems to be centralized in the hands of the President, the business manager, and the dean of students, though the faculty council has a strong voice. Students are involved on committees, including the Academic Council. Among changes the five students interviewed would like to see are a wider variety of courses, an increased number of majors, more professors who are interested in the students, an enrollment increased to 2,000, and a relaxing of campus rules (including being allowed to dance on campus).

Faculty, staff, and students alike mentioned the death of their former President as an incident that has affected their institution. They also mentioned a hurricane in 1970 which devastated both campus and community and caused the faculty and students to band together to recover from the devastation and to reorganize the campus. Also frequently mentioned among occurrences which have left their mark on UCC was the receipt of Title III funds and the implementation of the programs which would not have been possible wihtout them. UCC is running on a deficit right now. One of the interviewers stated that it is apparent that the institution has a great deal yet to accomplish. However, its achievement in the past few years, with assistance from Title III, has been "nothing less than dramatic."

Bluefield State College

(Bluefield, West Virginia)

In 1968 two bombs exploded within a week of each other at Bluefield State. One caused $75,000 damage to the gymnasium, the other caused minor damage to the Student Center. The bombings were racial in nature. Bluefield State, after 75 years as a black teacher preparation college was at the time rapidly changing to a predominately white vocational college. The displacement of blacks had started in 1965, but the turning point came in 1967 with the appointment of a white man as President.

The following year was one of "much unrest"; black students and faculty were incensed over "white people taking over their institution." After the bombings, the leadership of the dissident students was "cleaned out," and several are reportedly still serving jail terms. Since the incident, according to an administrator, "students have had a more serious attitude towards the college." The college, because of its firm stand on the violence, was able to gain the support of the immediate white community.

Nevertheless, the school is still struggling to overcome the consequences of that year of unrest. The school immediately lost 400 students and in the resulting financial crisis was forced to close its dormitories, which remain closed today. The interviewers found evidence of "continuing resentment" among the remaining black students and faculty over the incident. Enrollment still fails to reach previous levels.

Despite these problems, it was the feeling of many respondents that overall the college has "come up in its standards under the current President." Curriculum offerings have been expanded and the qualifications of the faculty have been improved. A number of "associate degree" programs have been added, and the school is attracting a "higher potential" student body (as measured by the three-point increase in the average ACT score of incoming freshmen). In the words of one of the interviewers, "It is almost as if a complete new institution had been established in 1967."

The new white student body, like the old predominately black student body before it, is comprised of "first generation" college students from low-income and low-education backgrounds who come to Bluefield State with the idea of getting a better education, a better job, and a better future than their parents had. In light of these concerns, Bluefield State has downplayed its liberal arts program in favor of a vocational or career-oriented approach. A top administrator explained the school's strategy. "We are doing a good job in our two-year occupational (associate degree) programs. We need to look for four-year programs--for example, in social work. We should move out of teacher education. The market is saturated," he said.

Most graduates still go into teaching, perhaps as many as 60%. Associate degree, or two-year, graduates generally go into industry, receiving "jobs with pay equal to four-year graduates." The associate degree programs, especially in engineering technology and nursing, are becoming increasingly more popular with students. Approximately one-third of the student body are now participating in these programs, and, according to several respondents, these are the only special programs which are attracting students to Bluefield State. In other cases students enroll simply because the school is close to home and relatively inexpensive.

With the dormitories closed, Bluefield State is entirely a commuter school. Partially as a consequence, student morale is rather low, and there is poor communication between students and faculty. The President explained, "We are a commuting institution with all of the characteristics of a commuting campus. The students are not involved."

Overall, faculty morale may be even lower than student morale. Many of the faculty are black and many of them are resentful. One administrator characterized the faculty as having "little enthusiasm for teaching or for their students." A faculty member seemed to see the problem more clearly. "The faculty is not a close-knit group. . . . It is difficult to develop strong feelings when an institution is in transition. It is more realistic to feel insecure." Another faculty member emphasized that the administration ought to develop "greater sensitivity to the needs and ideas of the faculty."

The administration apparently does try to at least hear faculty ideas. Through a broad-based committee system, the faculty voice is heard in all administration decisions. Students are also well represented. The President, however, is a dynamic and powerful man, and several respondents suggest that it is his vision of Bluefield State that guides the decision-making process.

The President's leadership and vision are based on a self-described emphasis on "teaching in a better institution." An important factor expected to help improve instruction is the Learning Center program--the key Title III program at Bluefield State. The use of the Learning Center has changed over the years. In the beginning, the Learning Center served a purely remedial purpose. Students needing remedial help were encouraged to use the Center and its resources to improve their basic skills. The Center was used especially for developmental reading work.

With the increasing emphasis on technology at Bluefield State, help with learning problems in mathematics and science became an increasingly critical need. In 1968, National Teaching Fellows provided released time during which regular faculty could work on improving the curriculum in their areas of specialization, but in light of this development it was decided that a more comprehensive approach was necessary. Consequently, Title III funds were used last summer to send two math and two science faculty members to the University of West Virginia to work on "teaching techniques and behavioral objectives" in their fields. These instructors are now writing materials for a slide-tape presentation at the Learning Center and are conducting seminars to share their summer training with other math and science faculty, who are expected to incorporate the new approaches into their own course presentations. Title III funds have also allowed Bluefield State to hire an audio-visual specialist for the Learning Center and to use the services of several consultants for planning and developing Learning Center resources and objectives.

Perhaps the most important reason for the need for a fresh start at the Learning Center is that the previous efforts were ineffective. "We must overcome the bad reputation of doing nothing with Title III programs in order for the faculty to be convinced of its value," a faculty member observed.

Aside from one respondent's belief that the Learning Center had "improved reading skills," there was a telling silence on the part of respondents who were asked to cite successful aspects of the school's Title III program. "The general attitude on campus, including that of the President, is that Title III simply has not been effectively used until the current academic year. . . . Title III has had very little visibility on campus. Most of its visibility was shrouded in confusion. It has been identified vaguely as the remedial program. Though at least one faculty member indicated that this was an unnecessary part of the college, most faculty do see the need to move in the remedial area and consequently feel that efforts in Title III, although largely unsuccessful thus far, are necessary," one interviewer concluded.

Other Title III program failures are the Alumni Development Office and the Bluefield State College Foundation. Title III programs at Bluefield State began with an added emphasis on developing the college's financial resources. These two offices were established for essentially that purpose. Respondents consistently reported that the alumni were not supportive of the school. Given the changing composition of the student body, it is not surprising that the alumni are not supportive; it is more difficult to understand why they would be expected to be supportive. In any case, there is no evidence that the offices have been successful in gaining financial resources for the institution. (Apparently the offices are a sensitive issue at Bluefield State; however, most respondents avoided so much as mentioning them.) Approximately $30,000 in Title III funds were used to develop these offices in 1968.

Loss of Title III funds would probably hurt the many educationally disadvantaged students that Bluefield State's "open door" policy attracts. Still, there is little evidence that present Title III funding has been effective in significantly helping these students. The burden rests with the school to justify further appropriations in this area. The results of this year's new program should be telling.

With faculty morale so low, an effective program for Bluefield State might be to provide faculty with released time in which to study for graduate degrees. Such an approach has led to improved morale and better instruction in other schools, and might lead to the same at Bluefield State.

The counseling services are very poor at Bluefield State. Both interviewers note that students there seem "confused as to personal identity, life goals, and career choice" and find that "much more counseling is needed." A new Title IV special service project has provided for intense counseling and tutorial work for 50 disadvantaged students, but many respondents felt that this effort was not extensive enough. Title III might be able to improve student personnel services by providing for new counselors or for better counselor training.

The American Association of Junior Colleges' Program With Developing Institutions (PWDI)

From 1968 to mid-1972 the American Association of Junior Colleges has been in charge of coordinating the most comprehensive of all cooperative arrangements financed under Title III of the 1965 Higher Education Act. As the Title III legislation stated that 24% of all Title III appropriations should go to two-year colleges, it was clear that sooner or later the AAJC would play a major role in the Title III program as it related to two-year colleges. When the U.S. Office of Education started receiving the first applications for Title III funding, it was noticed that especially proposals submitted by two-year colleges were of very low quality, a fact which seemed to reflect the low quality of many of these colleges. The USOE then contacted the AAJC and enlisted its help in assisting member institutions to write better proposals. It is thus that the AAJC's formal involvement with Title III began.

During the first year of the AAJC's Program With Developing Institutions (formerly the Program For Developing Institutions), the Association sent squads of consultants to campuses to see what colleges needed most and to help them write better grant applications. The Association acted as a clearinghouse and hired many outside consultants for this first task. Eighty-eight institutions received assistance from the AAJC during the first year of its PWDI, and approximately 80% of all Title III funds earmarked for two-year colleges during that year went to these institutions. Apart from consultants, the Association also used a series of "awareness" conferences to help member institutions realize the potential of Title III for their needs.

While the AAJC's overall role decreased in scope during PWDI's second and subsequent years of operation (partly due to budget cutbacks), the assistance it provided to member institutions became more specific. The task of organizing workshops--particularly those for faculty development--was delegated to regional organizations, which left the PWDI free to tackle more specific problems, such as (a) planning curricula for disadvantaged students, (b) helping groups of colleges enter into cooperative arrangments, and (c) serving as a resource center for two-year colleges receiving Title III funding by providing them with lists of consultants, informing them about Title III activities through a newsletter, publishing papers read at regional workshops, etc. Only slightly more than 50 institutions participated in the PWDI during its second year; however, most of these institutions had been with the Program since its inception. During the third and fourth years of PWDI's existence, the emphasis of the program shifted particularly toward encouraging the formation of new consortia. The number of institutions participating in the PWDI fluctuated around 40 in 1970-71 as well as in 1971-72. While the PWDI had been acting more directly as a coordinator during the first and second years, its activist role decreased as the AAJC became more and more an assisting institution in the latter part of the program.

While the organization of various types of workshops became increasingly the responsibility of regional groups of two-year colleges, the PWDI provided help in bringing the heads of these groups together to plan these workshops and institutes. The response from both individual participants in these workshops and institutions that cooperated was very positive. It is noteworthy that the PWDI has made a systematic attempt to evaluate its impact on participating institutions; to that purpose it analyzed feedback from regional workshops, data from short questionnaires sent to institutions, and impressions from frequent visits to campuses.

As of June, 1972, the AAJC's formal involvement in the Title III program will cease, and its PWDI will be terminated. Most services provided so far by the PWDI will become part of regular AAJC programs. This doesn't necessarily mean that the Association expects its involvement with Title III to stop altogether. Rather, the AAJC will now sell its services as an assisting institution whenever required.

When the AAJC's Program With Developing Institutions began, the Association hoped that individual institutions would each receive Title III funding for a three-year period in order to benefit from programs aimed at improving the quality of an institution in various areas. The PWDI planned a three-year sequence of assistance in the areas of curricular development, faculty development, and administrative improvement. This plan proved to be invaluable since most institutions which received aid through a Title III consortium were part of such programs for less than three years. The USOE's Division of College Support seems to have preferred a funding pattern that included a larger number of institutions for shorter periods, rather than a smaller number of colleges which would have gone through the whole three-year cycle proposed by the AAJC.

Despite a small staff and a relatively small budget ($116,000 for 1971-72), the AAJC's Program With Developing Institutions has been quite successful during its four years of existance.

A. Its single most important achievement seems to be its success in fostering closer inter-institutional cooperation. It is the PWDI which seems to have been one of the driving forces in encouraging institutions to cooperate in the form of creating consortia to obtain Title III funds. In many cases, this cooperation goes on even after the consortium has become ineligible for Title III funding. The most striking success story is that of the 16 two-year colleges in Puerto Rico, which had not communicated with each other prior to PWDI's effort to help them form a consortium. Even though most of the institutions are no longer Title III fund recipients, their cooperative arrangements have been maintained. Furthermore, the Puerto Rico two-year colleges are now part of the "mainstream" of the American two-year college system, from which they were totally isolated until recently.

B. As a result of receiving Title III aid, many institutions are now no longer developing but have joined the ranks of successful institutions. A number of these colleges have been able to improve to the degree where they have become assisting institutions to other two-year colleges. The improvement has been most marked in the areas of curriculum development (where the AAJC's central office provided assistance in setting up special programs) and faculty development (where regional workshops enabled a large number of faculty from two-year colleges to learn about new methods and approaches to teaching in their field).

C. Last but not least, the PWDI has helped two-year institutions by providing them with lists of reliable consultants in various fields. Names of consultants were referred to PWDI for inclusion in their directories by institutions which had used them and were in a position to evaluate their quality. The directories now cover all fields in which an institution might need assistance--from curriculum design to systems analysis--and the individual institution needing the services of a specialist now has the certainty that all potential consultants have been tried by another institution.

There is one area in which the PWDI has not been successful, although the lack of success can't be blamed on the program itself. The PWDI has not been able to intiate a consortium of colleges with large ethnic minorities enrollments. [An effort was made to establish a consortium of 19 such schools but it failed. Reasons for the failure are not clear, but one might be wide geographic dispersion of the schools, which would have made many consortium-type activities difficult to carry out.]

In sum, it seems that many two-year colleges benefitted from PWDI-sponsored activities to which they would not normally have had access. The USOE's decision to end its special relationship with the AAJC came at the right time, however, since the initial objectives of the PWDI have been achieved and since that Program's activities will now be integrated into on-going AAJC programs.

CASE STUDY

DIVISION OF COLLEGE SUPPORT, USOE

The Division of College Support has general responsibility for the allocation and monitoring of all funds awarded through Title III of the Higher Education Act. All of the program staff are full-time, although the director of the division also directs the Title V-E program as well as the Cooperative Education Program for the U.S. Office. A majority of the staff are program specialists, which implies that they have special expertise in either the area of black colleges or community colleges--the two groups which get a majority of the Title III allocations. Program specialists help to define the criteria for allocation of funds, and make some of the determinations of specific allocations to individual institutions. They also review interim reports, which are submitted during the year, and make site visits to the extent that time and budget permit. Because of her other responsibilities for Title V-E and the Cooperative Education Program, the Title III director has assigned a staff member as program manager for Title III.

The decisions as to the allocation of Title III funds are handled with the assistance of a group of 60 outside consultants who work in three groups of 20. These consultants are sent the Title III legislation in advance, as well as the guidelines and typical application folders. They then have a three-hour trial session with the Title III staff, using the consultants' "practice" evaluation to learn to make better decisions in evaluating proposals. Most of the consultants are college and university administrators. Unlike some other federal programs, the institution submitting a Title III request has to go through two steps. Not only must the proposal be evaluated as being worthwhile, but the institution itself must be defined as a "developing" one. It is at this stage of defining the institution as "developing" that the largest number of applicants get rejected (in 1971 there were 775 applicants for 200 awards).

A profile is developed from all institutions funded the previous year. Each application for new Title III money is screened against this profile. There are cut-off points at the top and the bottom to eliminate institutions that do not appear "developing" in terms of these profile criteria. It is the white four-year institutions that are often cut at this stage for being too "successful" and for not enrolling enough poor and minority students. In previous years, the grants have been allowed on a one-year basis only, but beginning with 1970-71 30% of the funding was for greater than one year, and another 30% will move into that category next year. This has made meant easier monitoring for the staff in that they have a previous history on what has been done in that particular project. However, the institution is not notified of the level of future funding, which creates problems. The timing of the grant awards has been another continual problem (indeed, throughout USOE), in that the announcements are made in April or May for programs to begin in September. By the time the grants are announced, it is too late to hire really competent faculty and staff for programs to begin in September. This problem has not yet been resolved, but may be alleviated somewhat as more and more funding moves into a multi-year pattern.

The Title III legislation is vague enough so that the staff is given considerable leeway in terms of who will be awarded Title III monies. Virtually all of the black institutions that are accredited have received sustained Title III funding. This is not true of white institutions, for which the Title III competition is much greater. (It is interesting that the legislation makes no mention of black colleges as such, but does indicate that 23% of the money is to be given to community colleges.) One of the major working criteria within the staff (not in the legislation) is that an institution should have approximately 40% of its student body made up of poor and minority youth. This is more than twice the national average. Some institutions with smaller percentages are funded, but this is a convenient cutting edge for eliminating proposals and cutting the proposal pool down to a reasonable size. Because 23% of the money must be awarded to community colleges under the legislation, there was a need early in the program to provide for some training of community colleges so that administrators could learn how to do grant proposals that would be specific enough to merit consideration. Because so few of them knew how to do this, planning grants were offered in the first year to the community colleges, and then a liaison relationship with the American Association of Junior Colleges was provided as an assisting agency with the notion that the Division of College Support would purchase expertise from AAJC to be used to develop competence in the community colleges themselves. Having served this purpose, AAJC is now fading into the background in terms of dollars received as an assisting agency for community college development, as the Division of College Support now feels that the community colleges can function more independently.

Some respondents from the Office of Management and Budget seem to feel that certain black institutions should be "graduated" right out of Title III in that they no longer need Title III in order to survive. Others feel that if this were to happen, the same black institutions might suffer a decline in effectiveness and be eligible once again for Title III. The second time, however, they would become much more dependent on the government handout.

The criteria for institutional eligibility are not supposed to be listed in a priority rank order, but it is quite clear that having a high percentage of poor and minority students has become some sort of major criterion. In addition, institutions must be "on the way" toward regional accreditation and must be "isolated from the mainstream of American higher education." These criteria are so vague that few institutions could be given grants without some additional, more specific criteria such as the percentage of minority and poor students enrolled.

The U. S. Office of Education has recently established a procedure called PGIS (Project Grant Information Service) which will be an information retrieval and storage system for all applications from all project grants from their inception to final decision. This program was just initiated in January, 1972, but it should have a significant impact on the staff's ability to keep up with the large volume of paper work on grant proposals. (It will also detect a number of individuals making requests of Title III who have also submitted proposals to other departments in the U. S. Office of Education.)

There was continual concern within the staff for the fact that they are spread much too thin and must be familiar with too many programs. In addition, the staff is convinced that many of the proposals show almost no student involvement in the institution's proposal formulation. There is also a lack of total commitment from institutional leaders (particularly department chairmen) in following through the objectives of the Title III proposal. The staff also feels severely restricted with regard to travel monies. This makes a systematic program of site visitation almost impossible; and, from other reports many of the participants in the colleges themselves do not know of any plan for site visits from the Division of College Support offices.

In addition, Title III staff feel that the communication about the role of federal programs on campuses is weak. They feel that approximately 50 institutions now have a basic "floor" of fiscal stability and organizational expertise and can now begin moving towards some in-depth programs that will provide them with true distinction. For example, Spelman would like to become a strong fine arts center, not just for black colleges, but for America. Tuskegee could become the national center for disadvantaged students; Bennett College could develop an even more outstanding program for science training for women; while Morgan State could become a national resource for urban education. These questions, involving the development of a Title III "elite" group of institutions, are very much in the forefront of discussions involving the "new thrust" of Title III.

There is considerable difference of opinion between the Division of College Support staff and other OE offices on the question of the amount of institutional diversity of program objectives for Title III. The Title III staff officers seem to favor wide diversity of institutional choice, while others would like a more restricted component emphasizing the established professions for the black colleges to develop programs around. The Division also has accomplished a number of relationships with programs that provide specific administrative services to Title III institutions, including TACTICS (Technical Assistance Consortium to Improve College Services), as well as other programs specifically designed to improve the quality of development offices and other administrative services on campuses, such as the development of effective placement offices.

There is little doubt that Title III has been a successful program in producing productive change in many institutions. The program has survived threatened cuts in congressional appropriations very well, due in no small part to the skill of the Director. But the staff has not been able to monitor programs very effectively, and fiscal accounting has been extremely difficult, due to the diversity of institutional practices. One wonders also at the lack of sophisticated thinking about evaluation among the staff. Perhaps, given the size of the program, small additions to the monitoring and evaluation functions should be made for the Division of College Support.

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE)

(Kansas City, Missouri)

Founded nine years ago with the goal of fostering closer cooperation between colleges and universities in the greater Kansas City area, KCRCHE is one of the best-known and most successful higher education consortia. There are slight variations in the number of KCRCHE institutions from year to year; sixteen institutions are members this year (1972). The consortium's national visibility stems from the fact that it is one of the largest and most professionally run higher education consortia.

Most KCRCHE members are private four-year liberal arts colleges; two members are public four-year colleges, and two are junior colleges. As a result of the preponderance of private liberal arts institutions, most KCRCHE programs are geared to their needs. Almost all the private member colleges have faced rather marked decreases in enrollment during the last few years; all of them have a large unused capacity and have to operate under rigid financial constraints. It is safe to say that, despite their financial difficulties, almost all KCRCHE members are by most criteria in the mainstream of American higher education. The main problem faced by these institutions is not how to become part of the mainstream but, rather, how to stay in it.

The member institutions established KCRCHE primarily in order to attract federal funds, which individual institutions could never hope to obtain. Title III has been KCRCHE's main, but not sole, support from

KCRCHE's inception. Grants from other federal sources (such as Title VII of the Social Security Act) are playing an increasingly important role. Federal funds provide approximately 85 per cent of the consortium's income; the rest comes from membership fees ($4,000 annually for each institution). At a funding level of approximately $300,00 for fiscal year 1971-72, Title III was KCRCHE's most important source of income during that year. Title III funds are not disbursed to the consortium but rather to one institution designated as the coordinating institution by the consortium. This arrangement does not mean, however, that the coordinating institution exercises control over the funds. It can actually be a disadvantage for an institution to act as coordinator: Rockhurst College, the grantee for several years, asked the consortium to be relieved of this function. The top administrators at Rockhurst felt that being the grantee institution for the consortium jeopardized their chances for obtaining other federal funds for their own use.

The consortium's structure is rather complex: the final authority lies with the board of directors, whose members are all presidents of member institutions. The chairmanship of the board rotates periodically among board members. The board appoints KCRCHE's executive director, who heads the consortium's central office with a large professional and support staff. The executive director is given autonomy to initiate and execute policies in the name of KCRCHE. (The high degree of autonomy is at least partly due to the person of the outgoing KCRCHE executive director, whose ability to cajole and persuade members of his board was quite remarkable.

A less dynamic successor is likely to have the degree of his autonomy curtailed by the board of directors.)

KCRCHE's executive director heads a staff of specialists in a variety of areas ranging from communications to systems analysis. These professionals work in close cooperation with a variety of committees, whose members all share the same function on their respective campuses--academic deans, admissions officers, business officers, head librarians, etc. The consortium's board of directors and the various committees meet often; communications between different committees and KCRCHE's central staff seem unusually good for a consortium of KCRCHE's size and complexity.

The consortium uses Title III funds for a wide variety of purposes:

(a) Curriculum Development. There are extensive agreements among KCRCHE member institutions to let students register for individual courses on other campuses. Almost all members participate in these arrangements. They are especially important for subject areas in which only a few institutions have adequate facilities. For example, William Jewell College's physics facilities can not be matched by most of the other institutions.

(b) Faculty Development. A number of KCRCHE institutions hired National Teaching Fellows, a few of whom remained after their year ended and joined the regular faculty. More important were inservice training programs and advanced graduate training for regular faculty. The consortium organized a fairly large number of workshops for faculty in different fields; both KCRCHE staff and respondents on the different campuses reported that these workshops had been very helpful. Quite a large number of faculty on different campuses were granted paid leaves of absence to obtain better academic credentials, usually doctorates. This is probably an area in which the consortium should do even more; although most schools are basically in the mainstream of American higher education in terms of most of the criteria commonly used, the proportion of faculty holding doctorates is quite low compared to similar schools elsewhere.

(c) Student Services. Consortium members have only recently started to increase their counseling services in a systematic manner; some of the schools have established Counseling Centers. The need for trained specialists in those schools is still great. Most of the KCRCHE colleges have some form of remedial programs for students with academic deficiencies; however, KCRCHE apparently hasn't had much impact. Very little staff time at KCRCHE is allocated to student affairs.

(d) Administrative Improvement. This is certainly the area in which the consortium has been most active and most successful. One of the major programs of the last few years (now completed) was the development of a PPB system specifically aimed at the needs of a small college. In cooperation with the Midwest Research Institute in Kansas City, Mo., KCRCHE's central office developed such a system. It is designed to be useful for short-term (budget) applications, medium-term (programming) applications, and long-range (planning) uses. The system is very versatile and provides information on financial as well as other matters (alumni, students, etc.). While none of the KCRCHE institutions has yet applied the total systems package to its needs, most of them use at least parts of the system. Even in cases where institutions are making relatively little use of the system, administrators are now at least aware of the system's potential and have become more sophisticated in their use of various types of data.

As a result of developing the data system, the KCRCHE central office has been urging member institutions to pool their resources in purchasing goods and services (insurance, food, automotive and other equipment) in order to get better value. The attempt has only been successful in the area of purchasing insurance. There are probably quite a few administrators on different campuses fearing that their autonomy might be curtailed if KCRCHE's central office took over the purchasing function.

Through KCRCHE, several colleges have decided to cooperate in the area of library services in order to share existing holdings and to avoid costly duplications. This program is still in its pilot stage and has yet to become operational. The question remains whether the relative geographic dispersion of KCRCHE institutions will make the system viable for all members, or whether it is more likely to favor the urban institution in the metropolitan Kansas City area.

A very complex telephone and tele-lecture network adopted by all member institutions is probably the most spectacular service developed by the KCRCHE central office. All development costs for this system were financed through Title III funds; the cost of operating the system, however, is borne by individual institutions. The KCRCHE telephone and tele-lecture network, combined with the installation of WATS lines on all campuses, is a brilliant technical achievement and is now being used as a model for similar systems elsewhere. Despite its technical excellence, the system does not seem to be too useful for a number of campuses because of the system's development and operational costs. It is true that the system has encouraged communication and cooperation among the KCRCHE institutions, but the price of developing the communications system was very high compared to the degree of usage the system gets today.

The question of how successful KCRCHE has been is difficult to answer. Most of KCRCHE's member institutions have been members for several years and intend to remain. Since KCRCHE is a voluntary consortium with relatively stiff membership fees, the member colleges obviously feel that the advantages of membership outweigh the disadvantages. But it is quite obvious that some institutions get more out of KCRCHE than others. An institution such as Rockhurst College has obviously profited more from its membership in the consortium than, say, Kansas City, Kansas, Community Junior College, which is a marginal member. It is almost inevitable that a consortium with as large a membership as KCRCHE would serve certain colleges more than others. A systematic cost-effectiveness computation would certainly show that some of KCRCHE's achievements could have been produced at lower cost. Nevertheless, there are unanticipated consequences of membership in a consortium which can not be measured in economic terms. While the measurable benefits of KCRCHE membership may have been quite small for certain schools, administrators at those schools still seem to think that their institution is now better off because of its membership in KCRCHE.

Technical Assistance Consortium
To Improve College Services
(TACTICS)

TACTICS is the single largest consortium ever funded under Title III. It is also the largest consortium of Black colleges. The amazing fact about TACTICS is the delay with which it was established--as Title III had been primarily aimed at Black colleges from the beginning, a consortium like TACTICS should have been built into the legislation in a similar way the 23 percent allocation figure for two-year colleges was built in.

TACTICS represents the first concerted efforts of Black colleges to go beyond such joint ventures as fund-raising and public relations in order to provide each of the Black colleges with a complete package of _all_ services they may need in order to become "developed" institutions. The consortium is--at least in theory--a very cleverly designed system for obtaining the maximum amount of outside aid with a minimum of strings attached.*

---

*The history of TACTICS goes back to 1968 when the presidents of Black colleges started meeting regularly to discuss the most obvious problem they all faced--lack of funds, especially lack of federal funds. Out of these meetings came the request for an audience with the President which came about eventually and in which the President promised increased financial support for Black colleges. A number of federal programs were altered to comply to the President's directive, and the need for a new vehicle to deal with the multiplicity of problems of Black higher education became obvious. The presidents of Black colleges made it clear that they wanted a comprehensive package of help and that they wanted to be in charge of the program. They felt that a white-dominated consortium would be unacceptable since it would only perpetuate the dependence of Black colleges on the white schools. This is how TACTICS was developed as the largest black-controlled consortium.

Since TACTICS became operational in mid-1971 it is too early to evaluate its impact. Nevertheless, it is a very well designed consortium with a dynamic and determined leadership, and since it is obviously the Bureau of College Support's major new venture it is likely to attract substantial Title III funds in the future as well. It is equally likely that TACTICS will soon become visible outside the Black higher education establishment and will attract funds from non-governmental sources as well.

TACTICS' financial success seems thus assured, and it is almost certain that the consortium's other goal--to provide each member institution with a sophisticated package of services--will also succeed. The consortium will provide the following major services for its member institutes:

___help in formulating programs and writing proposals
___assistance in establishing management information systems
___management planning assistance
___assistance in recruitment, financial aid, and admissions
___assistance in library administration and development
___assistance in academic planning

As opposed to the traditional approach whereby an institution hires a (sometimes unknown) consultant for each area that requires improvement, membership in TACTICS offers the advantage of having the consortium select a known consultant which considerably reduces the risks of the traditional approach. Also, all different types of counsulting are coordinated by TACTICS so that little of the burden of selecting consultants and planning for coordinating all expert advice falls on the institution.

TACTICS believes that the traditional approach of organizing workshops for different groups of professionals and then letting them go back to their home campus to fend for themselves doesn't work especially for institutions whose infrastructure is as undeveloped as that of many Black colleges. The consortium will offer workshops as a first step but then provide on-site assistance whenever necessary.

Providing a large number of colleges with a comprehensive and sophisticated package of services requires a complicated organizational framework. TACTICS' Coordinating Policy Committee is the decision-making body. Most of its members are presidents of Black institutions. Operational responsibility lies with the Executive Director of the consortium's coordinating staff. The major areas in which TACTICS offers assistance are each co-ordinated by an agency that specializes in that particular area (the Moton Foundation, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the Institute for Services to Education, and the United Board for College Development). Some of the sub-areas are coordinated by a program staff with--the TACTICS office. University Associates, Inc. provides technical planning, support, and advisory services to the consortium as a whole. More specifically, it has the responsibility for selecting consultants and working on government contracting strategies.

As TACTICS is really a series of related consortia, each service area is coordinated by a developing institution in accordance with Title III regulations. The coordinator's involvement in the area it is responsible for is rather nominal since the operational (as opposed to the fiscal) responsibility lies with the specialized agencies.

For program purposes, TACTICS distinguishes between general services available to all institutes who need and wish them (such as federal program analysis review and help in proposal writing, as well as the management information service) and specialized services available to subgroups of colleges (such as management and academic planning areas). If TACTICS' tactics work out as planned, each member institution will receive one of the general services and most colleges should receive one specialized service each year. TACTICS is planned for a three-year cycle. Thus, a college should be able to get all the services provided by the consortium within that period of time.

While all service areas have a large scope, the planned management information system with its data bank look like the most important long-range service since it will provide the most accurate source of data on Black higher education in the U. S. soon.

One of the long-range plans of TACTICS is to help member institutions improve to such a degree that they will become more truly service-oriented by setting up branch campuses in inner cities where educational opportunities are becoming increasingly scarce. Also, the consortium hopes to raise the level of its member institutions to such a degree that they will attract white students. This will be of great importance since it will give white students a unique and much needed opportunity to get to know Black culture in the U. S. first-hand.

It remains to be seen how effectively TACTICS will be able to fulfill its promises. As the program becomes more visible it is likely to be watched closely by white institutions who might eventually use the TACTICS approach to provide assistance to groups of special-interest colleges or institutions sharing some common denominators.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

OMB#: 51-S71019

Inst. Code:____________

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

August 1971

Dear Mr. President:

We have tried to make the attached questionnaire as simple as possible to answer by providing detailed instructions throughout the instrument. We realize, however, that we are asking for a wide variety of data from several different sources, and that you may have some difficulties in answering particular questions. We have tried to use HEGIS categories wherever possible so that you may use data you provided for HEGIS questionnaires to complete this instrument. If you do have any questions, please call us for clarification rather than leaving questions unanswered. We shall be glad to give you all the help we can; our phone number is (415) 642-5401.

We assume that this questionnaire will be completed not by one but by several persons. In order to make clear who completed which section, we would be most grateful if each of the persons involved would write his or her title on the routing section at the bottom of this page for each section he or she fills in.

All the information you provide will be held strictly confidential. More specifically, we shall not release any data on a particular institution; all data released to the U.S. Office of Education will be aggregate data on all institutions which return this questionnaire to us. The code number at the top of this page is for our information and will be used for retrieval purposes only. The individual content of your questionnaire will not be revealed to any person or institution outside the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Harold L. Hodgkinson

Dr. Harold L. Hodgkinson
Project Director
Study of Developing Institutions

			Title
PART 1:	I.	Data on President	
	II.	Data on Title III Program Coordinator	
	III.	Student Characteristics	
	IV.	Faculty Characteristics	
	V.	Characteristics of Administrators	
	VI.	Characteristics of Trustees	
	VII.	Financial Information	
	VIII.	Information on Title III	
PART 2:	Participating Institutions:	I. Financial Data	
		II. Program Data	
	Direct-Grant Institutions:	I. Financial Data	
		II. Program Data	
	Coordinators of Consortia:	I. Financial Data	
		II. Program Data	

STUDY OF DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

(Title III Evaluation Study)

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. Harold L. Hodgkinson
Center for Research and
Development in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, CA. 94704

PART I: GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

In trying to evaluate the impact of Title III funding on "developing institutions," it is important for us not only to know how these funds were allocated but also to relate that information to general institutional characteristics of grantee institutions. We would be very grateful if you could answer both the first and the second part of this questionnaire.

I. Data On President (Academic Year 1970-71)

(a) Age: ☐ Years

(b) Race: Black ☐ White ☐ Other ☐ Please Explain: ____________

(c) Highest earned degree: Bachelor's ☐ 1st Prof. Degree ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate ☐

(d) Institution where highest earned degree was conferred: ____________

(e) Year when highest earned degree was conferred: ☐

(f) Academic discipline in which highest earned degree was obtained: ____________

(g) Are you an alumnus of this institution? Yes ☐ No ☐

(h) Number of years spent as President on this campus: ☐

(i) Total number of years spent working on this campus: ☐

(j) Other positions held prior to being appointed President of this institution. Please mention the most recent position first:

Position	Institution or Organization	Years
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐
		☐ to ☐

Mr. President: We would very much value your opinion on the following statements and would be most grateful if you could complete items (a) through (l) yourself.

Please answer the following questions with "Yes" or "No."

		YES	NO
(a)	There is a general feeling that most things at this college are all right as they are.	☐	☐
(b)	The notion of colleges assuming leadership in bringing about social change is not an idea that is or would be particularly popular on this campus.	☐	☐
(c)	There is a long-range plan for the institution that is embodied in a written document for distribution throughout the college.	☐	☐
(d)	Currently, there is a wide discussion and debate on this campus about what the institution will or should be seeking to accomplish five or ten years from now.	☐	☐
(e)	There is a general willingness here to experiment with innovations that have shown promise at other institutions.	☐	☐
(f)	In the last few years, there have been a number of major departures from old ways of doing things at this institution.	☐	☐
	If "Yes," please characterize these changes in a few words:		
(g)	Students and faculty members whose records contain suggestions of unusual characteristics--e.g., bizarre dress, unpopular ideas, etc.--are not encouraged to remain on campus.	☐	☐
(h)	One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to try to select students with fairly similar personality traits.	☐	☐
(i)	One of the methods used to influence the flavor of the college is to hire faculty with fairly similar ideas.	☐	☐

(j) What other college is most like yours today? Please mention the name of one or two institutions:

(k) Five years from now, what other college will your institution resemble most closely? Please mention the name of one or two institutions:

(l) Given enough time and sufficient funds to develop, what college would you like your institution to resemble most closely? Please mention the name of one or two institutions:

I. Data On Title III Program Coordinator (Academic Year 1970/71)

(a) Age: ☐ Years

(b) Race: Black ☐ White ☐ Other ☐ Please explain: ____________________

(c) Highest earned degree: Bachelor's ☐ 1st Prof. Degree ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate ☐

(d) Institution where highest earned degree was conferred: ____________________

(e) Year when highest earned degree was conferred: ☐

(f) Academic discipline in which highest earned degree was obtained: ____________________

(g) Are you an alumnus of this institution? Yes ☐ No ☐

(h) Are you a full-time employee at your institution? Yes ☐ No ☐

(i) How many hours per week do you on the average spend on Title III? ☐ Hours

(j) Proportion of your time devoted to coordinating Title III programs on campus:

full time ☐
3/4 time ☐
1/2 time ☐
less than 1/2 time ☐

(k) Do you have any other titles? Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes," please specify:
(i) ____________________
(ii) ____________________
(iii) ____________________

(l) Number of years spent as Program Coordinator on this campus: ☐

(m) Total number of years spent working on this campus: ☐

(n) Other positions held prior to being appointed Title III Program Coordinator of this institution. Please mention the most recent position first:

Position	Institution or Organization	Years		
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐
		☐	to	☐

III. Characteristics of Student Body

(a) How many applicants for admission on all levels (first-time registrants only) did your college receive for the first terms of the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71.

Fall 1965	
Fall 1970	

(b) How many applicants on all levels (first-time registrants only) did your college admit--regardless of whether they actually enrolled--for the first terms of the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

Fall 1965	
Fall 1970	

(c) How many applicants on all levels (first-time registrants only) actually enrolled at your institution in the fall of the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

Fall 1965	
Fall 1970	

(d) Of the students who entered your institution as freshmen in the fall 1965 and 1970, what proportion were in the following high school ranks?

	Upper Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Bottom Quarter	Not Known	Total
Fall 1965	%	%	%	%	%	100%
Fall 1970	%	%	%	%	%	100%

(e) Full-and part-time enrollment in the fall 1965 and 1970:

	No. of Full-Time Students	No. of Part-Time Students	Total No. of Students
Fall 1965			
Fall 1970			

(f) Part-time students in terms of FTE's

Fall 1965	
Fall 1970	

(g) Proportion of full-time students by parental income in the fall 1965 and 1970:

	$0 to 2,999 Yearly	$3,000 to 5,999 Yearly	$6,000 to 8,999 Yearly	$9,000 to 11,999 Yearly	$12,000 to 14,999 Yearly	$15,000 and Over Yearly	Not Known	Total
Fall 1965	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fall 1970	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

(h) Full-time student body by race in the fall 1965 and 1970:

	Black	Caucasian	Other*	Total
Fall 1965	%	%	%	100 %
Fall 1970	%	%	%	100 %

*Please specify if "Other" exceeds 10%:

(i) Part-time student body by race in the fall 1965 and 1970:

	Black	Caucasian	Other*	Total
Fall 1965	%	%	%	100%
Fall 1970	%	%	%	100%

*Please specify if "Other" exceeds 10%:

(j) Full-time student body by sex in the fall 1965 and 1970:

	Male	Female	Total
Fall 1965	%	%	100%
Fall 1970	%	%	100%

(k) Part-time student body by sex in the fall 1965 and 1970:

	Male	Female	Total
Fall 1965	%	%	100%
Fall 1970	%	%	100%

(l) What field did your graduates enter right after graduating during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

	Further Study (4-yr. college)	Further Study (grad./prof. school)	Military	Teaching	Other* Occupation	Unknown	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	%	100%

*Please specify if "Other" exceeds 10%:

(m) What was the proportion of out-of-state students among full-time students in the fall 1965 and 1970?

Fall 1965	%
Fall 1970	%

(n) What was the proportion of students living on campus among full-time students in the fall 1965 and 1970?

Fall 1965	%
Fall 1970	%

(o) How many students were dismissed for academic reasons during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66	
1970/71	

(p) How many students were dismissed for non-academic reasons during the academic year 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66	
1970/71	

(q) What proportion of an original freshman class was graduated from your institution during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

(r) Number of graduates during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

1965/66
1970/71

(s) Total expenditures for student assistance (from all sources) during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

1965/66 $
1970/71 $

(t) Total expenditures for student aid from federal sources (such as EOG, WSP, etc.)--excluding institutional matching shares of federal funds--during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

1965/55 $
1970/71 $

(u) Number of students receiving any kind of financial assistance--including federal aid (such as fellowships, scholarships, loans, work-study jobs, etc.)--during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	No. of Full-Time Students	No. of Part-Time Students	Total No. of Students
1965/66			
1970/71			

(v) Funds spent on your work-study program during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/7

	Funds from Non-Federal Sources	Funds from Federal Sources	Total
1965/66	$	$	$
1970/71	$	$	$

VI. Characteristics of Faculty (the years refer to academic years)

(a) Number of full-and part-time faculty by sex during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Full-Time		Part-Time		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1965/66					
1970/71					

(b) Age distribution of the full-time faculty during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	20 to 35 Years	36 to 50 Years	51 to 65 Years	Over 65 Years	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	100%

(c) Age distribution of the part-time faculty during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	20 to 35 Years	36 to 50 Years	51 to 65 Years	Over 65 Years	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	100%

(d) Rank distribution of all full-time faculty during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71 (if no ranks or other ranks are used, please equate as closely as possible).

	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other*	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	100%

*Please check here if no rank system is used: ☐

*Please explain if a rank system different from the above is used:

(e) Rank distribution of all part-time faculty during the academic years 1965/66 a 1970/71 (if no ranks or other ranks are used, please equate as closely as possible).

	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other*	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	100%

*Please check here if no rank system is used: ☐

*Please explain if a rank system different from the above is used:

(f) Distribution of full-time faculty by fields taught during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71.

	Humanities (incl. Arts)	Natural and Pure Sciences (incl. geogr.)	Social Sciences (incl. psy., history, and education)	Applied Sciences (inc. Eng., occup. & career prog., home econ., & phys. ed.)	Total
1965/66					

(g) Distribution of part-time faculty by fields taught during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Humanities (incl. Arts)	Natural and Pure Sciences (incl. geogr.)	Social Sciences (incl. psy., history, and education)	Applied Sciences (inc. Eng., occup. & career prog., home econ., & phys. ed.)	Total
1965/66	☐ %	☐ %	☐ %	☐ %	100%
1970/71	☐ %	☐ %	☐ %	☐ %	100%

(h) Does your institution award tenure? Yes ☐ No ☐

(i) If tenure is awarded, what are the criteria on which the award is based?

Please check the appropriate box:

Rank ☐
Years of Service ☐
Other (Please specify) ☐ ....

(j) At what rank (or after how many years of service) is tenure usually awarded?

Please check the appropriate box:

Tenure based on Rank		Tenure based on Years of Service		Tenure based on other Criteria (Please Specify)
Assistant Professor	☐	0 - 1 Year	☐	.... ☐
Associate Professor	☐	2 - 4 Years	☐	
Full Professor	☐	More than 4 Years	☐	

(k) What was the average weekly course load taught by your full-time faculty during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66 ☐ Hours* per week (of which ☐ hours of classroom instruction).
1970/71 ☐ Hours* per week (of which ☐ hours of classroom instruction).

*Credit Hours

(l) What was the average weekly course load taught by your part-time faculty during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66 ____ Hours* per week (of which ____ hours of classroom instruction).
1970/71 ____ Hours* per week (of which ____ hours of classroom instruction).

*Credit Hours

(m) Distribution of full-time faculty by highest earned degree during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Less Than Bacca-laureate	Bacca-laureate	1st. Prof. Degree	Master's	Doctorate	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	100%

(n) Distribution of part-time faculty by highest earned degree during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Less Than Bacca-laureate	Bacca-laureate	1st. Prof. Degree	Master's	Doctorate	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	100%

(o) Proportion of full-time faculty by race in 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Black	Caucasian	Other*	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	100%

(p) Proportion of part-time faculty by race in 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Black	Caucasian	Other*	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	100%

*If "Other" exceeds 10% please give details:

(q) What proportion of your full-time and part-time faculty were alumni or alumnae of your institution during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

Full-Time Faculty		Part-Time Faculty	
1965/66	%	1965/66	%
1970/71	%	1970/71	%

(r) How much influence did your faculty have in the formation of policies in the following areas during the academic year 1970/71 as compared to 1965/66? Please check the appropriate box:

	More Influence in 1970/71 than in 1965/66	More Influence in 1965/66 than in 1970/71	No Difference
--grading policies (such as introducing new grading systems)	☐	☐	☐
--academic programs (such as introducing new programs)	☐	☐	☐
--institution-wide policies (such as advising on the budget)	☐	☐	☐

V. Characteristics of Administrators

(Note: We define as "administrators" college employees in supervisory positions who are not simultaneously members of the faculty. Please do not include department and/or division chairmen and the president).

(a) Total number of administrators during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
1965/66			
1970/71			

(b) Full-time administrators by race during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

Black	Caucasian	Other*	Total
%	%	%	100%
%	%	%	100%

*If "Other" exceeds 10%, please give details:

(c) Full-time administrators by sex during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Male	Female	Total
1965/66	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	100%

(d) Full-time administrators by highest earned degree during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Less Than Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	1st. Prof. Degree	Master's	Doctorate	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	100%

(e) What proportion of full-and part-time administrators were alumni or alumnae of your institution during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

Full-Time Administrators		Part-Time Administrators	
1965/66	%	1965/66	%
1970/71	%	1970/71	%

(f) How many faculty members (excluding department and/or division chairmen) also held part-time administrative positions during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66
1970/71

(g) Please enter the number of administrators (part-time and full-time) who work in the following areas, according to the hours per week spent in the respective field:

	1 - 10 hrs./week	11 - 20 hrs./week	Over 20 hrs./week
-Research and development of educational programs			
-Planning of physical facilities			
-Admission of students			
-Registration of students/ keeping student records			
-Job placement for students and alumni			
-Financial assistance to students			
-Purchase of equipment and materials			
-Administration of bookstore			
-Coordination and management of student housing			
-Personnel matters (acad. & non-acad. employees)			
-Keeping college financial records			
-Administration of college funds			
-Maintenance of physical plant			
-Public relations			
-Institutional security			
-Alumni affairs			
-Fundraising			
-Medical services for students			
-Student counseling			
	-	-	-
Total			

VI. Characteristics of Trustees

(a) Number of trustees during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

1965/66
1970/71

(b) Trustees by race during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Black	Caucasian	Other*	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	100%

(c) Trustees by sex during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Male	Female	Total
1965/66	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	100%

(d) Trustees by highest earned degree during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	Less Than Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	1st. Prof. Degree	Master's	Doctorate	Total
1965/66	%	%	%	%	%	100%
1970/71	%	%	%	%	%	100%

(e) Trustees by occupation during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

	1965/66	1970/71
-Banking and Finance	%	%
-Medical Profession	%	%
-Lawyers	%	%
-Self-Employed Businessmen	%	%
-Executives	%	%
-Educators	%	%
-Clergymen	%	%
-Engineers & Architects	%	%
-Public Officials	%	%
-Other*	%	%
Total	100%	100%

*If "Other" exceeds 10%, please give details:

(f) How often did the trustees meet during the years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66 /__________/Times
1970/71 /__________/Times

(g) What proportion of trustees lived within one hundred miles of your insitution during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66 /__________%/
1970/71 /__________%/

(h) What proportion of trustees were alumni or alumnae of your institution during the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71?

1965/66 /__________%/
1970/71 /__________%/

(i) What are the procedures used to acquaint trustees with the working of the institution?

(j) How are trustees selected and appointed, and by whom?

VII. Financial Information

(a) Budgets for the academic years 1965/66 and 1970/71:

Current Fund Income	1965/66	1970/71
1. Student tuition and fees	$	$
2. Governmental appropriations		
(a) Federal government	$	$
(b) State government	$	$
(c) Local government	$	$
3. Private gifts and grants		
(a) Value of contributed services	$	$
(b) Foundation grants	$	$
(c) Other private support from all sources	$	$
4. Endowment income	$	$
5. Student aid grants, all sources	$	$
6. Auxiliary enterprises	$	$
7. All other current fund revenues	$	$
Total Current Fund Revenues	$	$

Current Fund Expenditures	1965/66	1970/71
1. Instruction and departmental research		
(a) Faculty salaries	$	$
(b) All other expenditures	$	$
2. General administrative and general institutional expense		
(a) Administrative/Staff salaries	$	$
(b) All other administrative expense	$	$
3. Libraries	$	$
4. Sponsored research	$	$
5. Extension and public service	$	$
6. Physical plant maintenance and operation	$	$
7. Student aid grants	$	$
8. Auxiliary enterprises	$	$
9. All other expenditures from current fund revenues	$	$

(b) Please describe the nature of the most frequently "contributed services":

(c) Who provides these "contributed services?" (Please mention occupation.)

(d) Are any of the persons providing "contributed services" alumni or trustees?

Please check one:

-some are alumni ☐
-some are trustees ☐
-some are alumni and some are trustees ☐
-neither of the above ☐

(e) Did your institution ever borrow funds from any source--including endowment funds--to cover operating expenses between September 1965 and May 1971?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes," please mention the academic years: ☐ ☐ ☐

(f) We would appreciate if you could tell us in one or two sentences what your major financial problems are:

VIII. General Title III Information

Within the last five years, hundreds of "developing institutions," i.e., colleges which attempt to raise their overall quality with Federal assistance, have been the recipients of Title III grants. Four different types of institutions can be distinguished in terms of how they received Title III funds:

(a) Participating institutions are colleges which receive such funds through a consortium of which they are a member;

(b) Direct-Grant institutions are colleges which receive Title III funds for their own use directly from the U.S. Office of Education;

(c) Coordinators of consortia receive such funds and subsequently allocate them in one form or another to participating institutions which are members of the consortium;

(d) Assisting institutions (which are usually educational institutions, business corporations, or research organizations) are hired by individual Title III grantees or consortia for the purpose of providing training or consulting services.

Please check the different grantee statuses your institution held since the beginning of the Title III program in 1965/66:

Years	Participating Institution	Direct-Grant Institution	Coordinator of Consortia	Assisting Institution
1965/66	☐	☐	☐	☐
1966/67	☐	☐	☐	☐
1967/68	☐	☐	☐	☐
1968/69	☐	☐	☐	☐
1969/70	☐	☐	☐	☐
1970/71	☐	☐	☐	☐

If your college was at any time since 1965/66 an assisting institution receiving Title III monies through another institution, please name the institution(s) assisted, the nature of your assistance and the year during which this cooperation took place:

Institution	Nature of Assistance	Academic Year
____________	____________________	1965/66 ☐
____________	____________________	1966/67 ☐
____________	____________________	1967/68 ☐
____________	____________________	1968/69 ☐
____________	____________________	1969/70 ☐
____________	____________________	1970/71 ☐

While the majority of grantee institutions receive Title III funds in one capacity only (usually as a participating institution or a direct-grant institution), a number of colleges have received such monies in more than one capacity. You will notice that Part II of the questionnaire is in three different colors. Each color stands fo one particular capacity. Thus, if your institution received Title III monies in a single capacity only, please fill in the appropriate section only (top of each page mentions the capacity to which the page refers) and disregard the others. If your institution received such funds in more than one capacity, please fill in both (or all three) sections. We didn't include a special section for assisting institutions since only a very small number of "developing institutions" did simultaneously serve as assisting institutions; however, should your college at any time since 1966 have served as an assisting institution, we would be most grateful if you could give some details on the previous ~~following~~ page. This part of the questionnaire asks for information about the use of Title III funds for all years since the program was enacted. Please be sure to always specify the year during which a certain program was in existence. We would be most grateful if you could provide this information even if you are not currently receiving Title III funds.

So far, Title III funds have been used primarily in four areas: curriculum development, faculty development, administrative improvement, and student services. Curriculum improvement refers to the improvement of existing and the establishment of new curricula; faculty improvement refers to raising the level of competence of the faculty either by adding visiting scholars--such as National Teaching Fellows or Professors Emeriti--to the faculty, or by providing in-service training or advanced graduate training to members of the regular faculty. Administrative improvement refers to raising both effectiveness and efficiency of the college administration through in-service and advanced graduate training for administrators, through the use of consultants for planning administrative reorganization, and through the establishment of offices dealing with such functions as development, planning, and institutional studies. Student services may have been improved by establishing or improving counseling services, by instituting student exchange programs with other colleges or universities, or by various other means.

We are interested not only in how you allocated Title III funds in terms of the four broad areas mentioned before, but also in the specific programs which were made possible by these funds. Also, we would very much like to know whether, in your view, these programs were successful. Please be as specific as you can in answering the open-ended questions.

END OF PART I

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

This section will examine funding patterns and types of programs initiated WITH TITLE III FUNDS BY PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS. It will concentrate on the areas of curriculum development, faculty development, administrative improvement, and student services.

The first segment of this section, I. FINANCIAL DATA, deals exclusively with financial information concerning the major programs which you have initiated with Title III funds.

The second segment of this section, II. PROGRAM DATA, deals more with descriptive aspects of the programs you initiated with Title III assistance.

TITLE III FUNDS BY PROGRAM

I. Financial Data

A. Curriculum Development

	Basic Academic Curriculum	Remedial Pre-College Curriculum	Occupational and Career Curriculum	Other (Write in Program & Year)....................	Total Funds Curriculum Development	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
5/66	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
6/67						Yes ☐ No ☐
7/68						Yes ☐ No ☐
8/69						Yes ☐ No ☐
9'70						Yes ☐ No ☐
0 '1						Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Faculty Development

	National Teaching Fellows	Professors Emeriti	Inservice Training for Faculty	Advanced Graduate Training for Faculty	Other (Write in Program & Year)....................	Total Funds for Faculty Development	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
5/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
6/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
7/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
8/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
9/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
0/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Administrative Improvement

	Inservice Training for Administrators	Advanced Graduate Training for Administrators	Use of Outside Consultants	Offices with New Functions (e.g., Instit. Research)	Other (Write in Program & Year)....................	Total Funds for Administrative Improvement	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
5/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
6/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
7/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
8/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
9/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
0/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

D. Student Services (Please Specify Additional Programs.)

	Counseling & Guidance	Tutorial & Remedial	Health Services	Other (Write in Program & Year)....................	Other (Write in Program & Year)....................	Total Funds for Student Services	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
65/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
66/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
67/6							Yes ☐ No ☐
68/							Yes ☐ No ☐
69/							Yes ☐ No ☐
70/7							Yes ☐ No ☐

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

E. Data on Funds Applied For, Funds Received, and Funds Returned

(1) A relatively large number of Title III recipients have returned part of their grants during the past five years. At the same time, many institutions which did receive Title III funds obtained considerably less than they had applied for. We would like to know more about these trends and would be grateful if you could fill in the table below:

Years Funds Were Applied For	Funds Applied For	Funds Received	Funds Returned	Date When Funds Were Returned
1965/66	$	$	$	
1966/67	$	$	$	
1967/68	$	$	$	
1968/69	$	$	$	
1969/70	$	$	$	

(2) If your institution did return any Title III funds, please explain their non-use and mention the fiscal years for which those funds had originally been allocated:

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

II. PROGRAM DATA

A. Curriculum Development

(1) Please turn back to page 19to see if 15 percent or more of curriculum development monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What specific programs aimed at raising the quality and breadth of the basic curriculum did you establish through Title III funds? Please mention the fiscal years during which these programs were in existence:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__

(3) What kinds of remedial programs did your institution establish and/or continue with the help of Title III funds?

Description of Program	From (Year) To
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__

(4) What types of occupational and career curricula did you establish and/or continue with Title III funds? Please mention the fiscal years during which these programs were in existence:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__

(5) Of the different types of programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(6) Of the different types of programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(7) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

B. Faculty Development

(1) Please turn back to page 19 to see if 15 percent or more of faculty development monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) In what departments did the National Teaching Fellows work, and what was the impact of the NTFs on faculty development?

(3) In what departments did the Professors Emeriti work, and what was the impact of these scholars?

(4) What different kinds of in-service training did your faculty participate in, and where were these programs usually held? Please specify the appropriate year:

Description of Program	Number of Faculty	Dates

(5) How many of your faculty did receive advanced graduate training under Title III, and what were their academic subjects?

Subjects	Number of Faculty	Years
______________________	☐	19__ to 19__
______________________	☐	19__ to 19__
______________________	☐	19__ to 19__
______________________	☐	19__ to 19__

(6) Where did they receive this training?

(7) What degrees did they earn?

(8) How many of your faculty members earned higher degrees through direct use of Title III funds and then left the institution?

(9) Of the different faculty development programs funded with Title III monies, which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(10) Of the different faculty development programs funded with Title III monies, which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(11) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

C. Administrative Improvement

(1) Please turn back to page 19 to see if 15 percent or more of administrative improvement monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What different kinds of in-service training did your administrators participate in, and where were these programs usually held? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years.

Description of Program	Institution	Year
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__

(3) How many of your administrators did receive advanced graduate training under Title III? What specific kind of training did they receive, and where? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years:

Type of Training	Number of Administrators	Institution	Year
			19__ to 19__
			19__ to 19__
			19__ to 19__
			19__ to 19__

(4) What tasks did your consultants carry out? Who were these consultants? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years:

Description of Task	Name of Firm (or individual)	Dates

(5) Did your institution establish offices for development, planning, or institutional studies? If so, where and when were these offices established? Please mention the appropriate fiscal years.

Offices	Dates

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

(6) Of the different types of programs for administrative improvement mentioned in (1) to (5), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(7) Of the different types of programs for administrative improvement mentioned in (1) to (5), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(8) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

D. Student Services

(1) Please turn back to page 19to see if 15 percent or more of student services was allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What types of counseling and guidance programs were funded through Title III? Please explain and specify the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
________________________	19__ to 19__
________________________	19__ to 19__
________________________	19__ to 19__

(3) What types of tutorial and remedial services were funded through Title III? Please explain and specify the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
________________	19__ to 19__
________________	19__ to 19__
________________	19__ to 19__

(4) What types of health service programs were funded through Title III? Please specify and indicate the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
________________	19__ to 19__
________________	19__ to 19__
________________	19__ to 19__

(5) Of the different student services programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(6) Of the different student services programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(7) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

E. General Evaluation

(1) In your opinion, in what areas did Title III funds strengthen your institution most? And in which least? Please check the appropriate boxes:

	Funds Most Helpful	Funds Fairly Helpful	Funds Not Helpful	No Program in Area
Curriculum Development				
Basic Academic Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Remedial Pre-College Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vocational Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty Development				
National Teaching Fellows	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professors Emeriti	☐	☐	☐	☐
In-Service Training for Regular Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced Graduate Training for Regular Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administrative Improvement				
In-Service Training for Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced Graduate Training for Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of Outside Consultants	☐	☐	☐	☐
Establishment of New Offices (e.g., Planning)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student Services				
Counseling and Guidance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tutorial and Remedial	☐	☐	☐	☐
Health Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify)				
____________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐	☐	☐

(2) Of all the programs funded through Title III, which had you anticipated to be most successful? Which were, in fact, most successful?

(3) Do you have any suggestions concerning programs you have not yet been able to initiate, but which you feel have great promise? Please list and explain:

DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

This section will examine funding patterns and types of programs initiated WITH TITLE III FUNDS BY DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS. It will concentrate on the areas of curriculum development, faculty development, administrative improvement, and student services.

The first segment of this section, I. FINANCIAL DATA, deals exclusively with financial information concerning the major programs which you have initiated with Title III funds.

The second segment of this section, II. PROGRAM DATA, deals more with descriptive aspects of the programs you initiated with Title III assistance.

TITLE III FUNDS BY PROGRAM
I. Financial Data
A. Curriculum Development

	Basic Academic Curriculum	Remedial Pre-College Curriculum	Occupational and Career Curriculum	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds Curriculum Development	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66		$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67						Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68						Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69						Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70						Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71						Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Faculty Development

	National Teaching Fellows	Professors Emeriti	Inservice Training for Faculty	Advanced Graduate Training for Faculty	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds for Faculty Development	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66	$	$		$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Administrative Improvement

	Inservice Training for Administrators	Advanced Graduate Training for Administrator	Use of Outside Consultants	Offices with New Functions (e.g., Instit. Research)	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds for Administrative Improvement	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

D. Student Services (Please Specify Additional Programs.)

	Counseling & Guidance	Tutorial & Remedial	Health Services	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds for Student Services	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

E. Data on Funds Applied For, Funds Received, and Funds Returned

(1) A relatively large number of Title III recipients have returned part of their grants during the past five years. At the same time, many institutions which did receive Title III funds obtained considerably less than they had applied for. We would like to know more about these trends and would be grateful if you could fill in the table below:

Years Funds Were Applied For	Funds Applied For	Funds Received	Funds Returned	Date When Funds Were Returned
1965/66	$	$	$	
1966/67	$	$	$	
1967/68	$	$	$	
1968/69	$	$	$	
1969/70	$	$	$	

(2) If your institution did return any Title III funds, please explain their non-use and mention the fiscal years for which those funds had originally been allocated:

DIRECT-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

II. PROGRAM DATA

A. Curriculum Development

(1) Please turn back to page 30 to see if 15 percent or more of curriculum development monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What specific programs aimed at raising the quality and breadth of the basic curriculum did you establish through Title III funds? Please mention the fiscal years during which these programs were in existence:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__

(3) What kinds of remedial programs did your institution establish and/or continue with the help of Title III funds?

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__

(4) What types of occupational and career curricula did you establish and/or continue with Title III funds? Please mention the fiscal years during which these programs were in existence:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__

(5) Of the different types of programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(6) Of the different types of programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(7) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

B. Faculty Development

(1) Please turn back to page 30 to see if 15 percent or more of faculty development monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) In what departments did the National Teaching Fellows work, and what was the impact of the NTFs on faculty development?

(3) In what departments did the Professors Emeriti work, and what was the impact of these scholars?

(4) What different kinds of in-service training did your faculty participate in, and where were these programs usually held? Please specify the appropriate year:

Description of Program	Number of Faculty	Dates
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	

(5) How many of your faculty did receive advanced graduate training under Title III, and what were their academic subjects?

Subjects	Number of Faculty	Years
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__

(6) Where did they receive this training?

(7) What degrees did they earn?

(8) How many of your faculty members earned higher degrees through direct use of Title III funds and then left the institution?

(9) Of the different faculty development programs funded with Title III monies, which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(10) Of the different faculty development programs funded with Title III monies, which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(11) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

C. Administrative Improvemen

(1) Please turn back to page 30 to see if 15 percent or more of administrative improvement monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What different kinds of in-service training did your administrators participate in, and where were these programs usually held? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years.

Description of Program	Institution	Year
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__

(3) How many of your administrators did receive advanced graduate training under Title III? What specific kind of training did they receive, and where? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years:

Type of Training	Number of Administrators	Institution	Year
	☐		19__ to 19__
	☐		19__ to 19__
	☐		19__ to 19__
	☐		19__ to 19__

(4) What tasks did your consultants carry out? Who were these consultants? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years:

Description of Task	Name of Firm (or individual)	Dates

(5) Did your institution establish offices for development, planning, or institutional studies? If so, where and when were these offices established? Please mention the appropriate fiscal years.

Offices	Dates

(6) Of the different types of programs for administrative improvement mentioned in (1) to (5), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(7) Of the different types of programs for administrative improvement mentioned in (1) to (5) which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(8) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

D. Student Services

(1) Please turn back to page 30 to see if 15 percent or more of student services was allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What types of counseling and guidance programs were funded through Title III? Please explain and specify the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__

(3) What types of tutorial and remedial services were funded through Title III? Please explain and specify the fiscal years during which such programs were funded.

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__

(4) What types of health service programs were funded through Title III? Please specify and indicate the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__
______________________	19__ to 19__

(5) Of the different student services programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(6) Of the different student services programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(7) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

E. General Evaluation

(1) In your opinion, in what areas did Title III funds strengthen your institution most? And in which least? Please check the appropriate boxes:

	Funds Most Helpful	Funds Fairly Helpful	Funds Not Helpful	No Program in Area
Curriculum Development				
Basic Academic Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Remedial Pre-College Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vocational Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty Development				
National Teaching Fellows	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professors Emeriti	☐	☐	☐	☐
In-Service Training for Regular Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced Graduate Training for Regular Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administrative Improvement				
In-Service Training for Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced Graduate Training for Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of Outside Consultants	☐	☐	☐	☐
Establishment of New Offices (e.g., Planning)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student Services				
Counseling and Guidance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tutorial and Remedial	☐	☐	☐	☐
Health Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify)				
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐

(2) Of all the programs funded through Title III, which had you anticipated to be most successful? Which were, in fact, most successful?

(3) Do you have any suggestions concerning programs you have not yet been able to initiate, but which you feel have great promise? Please list and explain:

COORDINATORS OF CONSORTIA

This section will examine funding patterns and types of programs initiated WITH TITLE III FUNDS BY COORDINATORS OF CONSORTIA. It will concentrate on the areas of curriculum development, faculty development, administrative improvement, and student services.

The first segment of this section, I. FINANCIAL DATA deals exclusively with financial information concerning the major programs which you have initiated with Title III funds.

The second segment of this section, II. PROGRAM DATA, deals more with descriptive aspects of the programs you initiated with Title III assistance.

TITLE III FUNDS BY PROGRAM
I. Financial Data
A. Curriculum Development

	Basic Academic Curriculum	Remedial Pre-College Curriculum	Occupational and Career Curriculum	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds Curriculum Development	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67						Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68						Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69						Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70						Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71						Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Faculty Development

	National Teaching Fellows	Professors Emeriti	Inservice Training for Faculty	Advanced Graduate Training for Faculty	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds for Faculty Development	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Administrative Improvement

	Inservice Training for Administrators	Advanced Graduate Training fo Administrat	Use of Outside Consultants	Offices with New Functions (e.g., Instit. Research)	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds for Administrative Improvement	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/66	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

D. Student Services (Please Specify Additional Programs.)

	Counseling & Guidance	Tutorial & Remedial	Health Services	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Other (Write in Program & Year).......	Total Funds for Student Services	Do T. III Funds Constitute 50% or More of Your Total Budget for these Areas?
1965/65	$	$	$	$	$	$	Yes ☐ No ☐
1966/67							Yes ☐ No ☐
1967/68							Yes ☐ No ☐
1968/69							Yes ☐ No ☐
1969/70							Yes ☐ No ☐
1970/71							Yes ☐ No ☐

E. Data on Funds Applied For, Funds Received, and Funds Returned

(1) A relatively large number of Title III recipients have returned part of their grants during the past five years. At the same time, many institutions which did receive Title III funds obtained considerably less than they had applied for. We would like to know more about these trends and would be grateful if you could fill in the table below:

Years Funds Were Applied For	Funds Applied For	Funds Received	Funds Returned	Date When Funds Were Returned
1965/66	$	$	$	
1966/67	$	$	$	
1967/68	$	$	$	
1968/69	$	$	$	
1969/70	$	$	$	

(2) If your institution did return any Title III funds, please explain their non-use and mention the fiscal years for which those funds had originally been allocated:

II. PROGRAM DATA

A. Curriculum Development

(1) Please turn back to page 41 to see if 15 percent or more of curriculum development monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What specific programs aimed at raising the quality and breadth of the basic curriculum did you establish through Title III funds? Please mention the fiscal years during which these programs were in existence:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__

(3) What kinds of remedial programs did your institution establish and/or continue with the help of Title III funds?

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__

(4) What types of occupational and career curricula did you establish and/or continue with Title III funds? Please mention the fiscal years during which these programs were in existence:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__

(5) Of the different types of programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(6) Of the different types of programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(7) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

B. Faculty Development

(1) Please turn back to page 41 to see if 15 percent or more of faculty development monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) In what departments did the National Teaching Fellows work, and what was the impact of the NTFs on faculty development?

(3) In what departments did the Professors Emeriti work, and what was the impact of these scholars?

(4) What different kinds of in-service training did your faculty participate in, and where were these programs usually held? Please specify the appropriate year:

Description of Program	Number of Faculty	Dates
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	
	☐	

(5) How many of your faculty did receive advanced graduate training under Title III, and what were their academic subjects?

Subjects	Number of Faculty	Years
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__

(6) Where did they receive this training?

(7) What degrees did they earn?

(8) How many of your faculty members earned higher degrees through direct use of Title III funds and then left the institution?

(9) Of the different faculty development programs funded with Title III monies, which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(10) Of the different faculty development programs funded with Title III monies, which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(11) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

C. Administrative Improvement

(1) Please turn back to page 41 to see if 15 percent or more of administrative improvement monies were allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What different kinds of in-service training did your administrators participate in, and where were these programs usually held? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years.

Description of Program	Institution	Year
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__
		19__ to 19__

(3) How many of your administrators did receive advanced graduate training under Title III? What specific kind of training did they receive, and where? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years:

Type of Training	Number of Administrators	Institution	Year
			19__ to 19__
			19__ to 19__
			19__ to 19__
			19__ to 19__

(4) What tasks did your consultants carry out? Who were these consultants? Please specify the appropriate fiscal years:

Description of Task	Name of Firm (or individual)	Dates

(5) Did your institution establish offices for development, planning, or institutional studies? If so, where and when were these offices established? Please mention the appropriate fiscal years.

Offices	Dates

(6) Of the different types of programs for administrative improvement mentioned in (1) to (5), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(7) Of the different types of programs for administrative improvement mentioned in (1) to (5), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(8) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

D. Student Services

(1) Please turn back to page 41 to see if 15 percent or more of student services was allocated to "other." If so, explain:

(2) What types of counseling and guidance programs were funded through Title III? Please explain and specify the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__
______________________________	19__ to 19__

(3) What types of tutorial and remedial services were funded through Title III? Please explain and specify the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__

(4) What types of health service programs were funded through Title III? Please specify and indicate the fiscal years during which such programs were funded:

Description of Program	From (Year) To
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__
	19__ to 19__

(5) Of the different student services programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the most successful, and why?

(6) Of the different student services programs mentioned in (1) to (4), which ones would you regard as the least successful, and why?

(7) Please add any other comments you may want us to know:

E General Evaluation

(1) In your opinion, in what areas did Title III funds strengthen your institution most? And in which least? Please check the appropriate boxes:

	Funds Most Helpful	Funds Fairly Helpful	Funds Not Helpful	No Program in Area
Curriculum Development				
Basic Academic Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Remedial Pre-College Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vocational Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty Development				
National Teaching Fellows	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professors Emeriti	☐	☐	☐	☐
In-Service Training for Regular Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced Graduate Training for Regular Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administrative Improvement				
In-Service Training for Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced Graduate Training for Administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of Outside Consultants	☐	☐	☐	☐
Establishment of New Offices (e.g., Planning)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration--Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student Services				
Counseling and Guidance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tutorial and Remedial	☐	☐	☐	☐
Health Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
______________ ____	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify)				
______________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
______________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
______________________	☐	☐	☐	☐
______________________	☐	☐	☐	☐

(2) Of all the programs funded through Title III, which had you anticipated to be most successful? Which were, in fact, most successful?

(3) Do you have any suggestions concerning programs you have not yet been able to initiate, but which you feel have great promise? Please list and explain:

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW AGENDA

(HAND THIS TO RESPONDENT)

INTERVIEW AGENDA

We are here under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education and the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, in order to find out what impact the Title III program for Developing Institutions has had (As you may know, Title III is part of the 1965 Higher Education Act and is to assist promising developing institutions in strengthening their academic environment.)

In the interview, we shall ask you a series of questions dealing with the following topics

1. General background information about yourself.
2. Your views on the impact of Title III programs on the campus.
    (a) Quality of faculty (NTF, workshop, consortia).
    (b) Quality and quantity of remedial and counseling services.
    (c) Quality of administrative operation (workshops, consultants, consortium activities).
    (d) Curriculum change.
3. The college as a whole and what you think of it.
    (a) Major changes on campus.
    (b) Your views on students, faculty, curriculum, and administration.

Thank you very much in advance for your cooperation!

Developing Institutions Project (Title III Evaluation Study)
Center for Research and Development In Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Description of Respondent

Institution____________________________________ Date________________

Interviewer____________________

Respondent Background Data:

(Hand respondent Interview Agenda)

Name of Respondent____

Respondent's: Sex: M ☐ F ☐

Race: Black ☐ Caucasian ☐ Other ☐____________

1. Would you tell me something about your background and connection with this institution? (Probe present academic area, rank, and whether full-time or part-time).

Fac. Rank		Position (Function)	
Prof.	____________	National Teaching Fellow	____________
Assoc.	____________	Professor Emeritus	____________
Asst.	____________	Title III Coordinator	____________
Instr.	____________	Administrative Position	____________
Lect.	____________		
Other:	____________ (Write in)	Other:	____________ (Write in)

Academic Field:____

Appointment: Full-time ☐ Part-time ☐

Years on Campus: ________________

Respondent's age: ________(Do Not Press This)

Institution from which highest earned degree received:

____

Highest earned degree:________________________________

Alumnus of this institution: Yes ☐ No ☐

- -

Assessment of Interview: Low ... High

Respondent's knowledgeability____ 0 1 2 3 4

" candidness____ 0 1 2 3 4

" interest in the interview 0 1 2 3 4

Your rapport with the respondent__ 0 1 2 3 4

Did you enjoy the interview? Why-why not?________________________________

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

2. Have you been involved with Title III programs on this campus?

Yes ☐ (Go on to question 10)
No ☐ (Continue on to question 3)

(FOR THOSE NOT INVOLVED WITH TITLE III)

3. Although you have not been involved with Title III, could you explain what you know of its use of this campus?

4. What do your colleagues think about Title III programs?

5. Are you aware of any changes in these programs over the last few years?

6. Do you know which Title III programs are considered the most useful on this campus?

7. (If the respondent's college is part of a Title III consortium). Your college has participated in the ____________________ consortium. Do you know how your institution cooperates with other members of the consortium?

8. Did your college benefit from its participation in this consortium?

9. Do you think that the consortium members are going to continue their cooperation once the Title III program has been completed? (Go on to question 27)

(FOR THOSE INVOLVED WITH TITLE III)

10. Would you describe the nature of your institution's involvement with Title III?

11. In what ways were you personally involved?

12. How long have you personally been involved in Title III--funded programs?

13. Has your involvement changed over the last few years?

14. What aspects of the Title III programs have you found to be the most successful on this campus?

15. Has their been a change in emphasis in Title III programs over the last few years.

16. (If the respondent's college is part of a Title III consortium). Your college has participated in the ____________________ consortium. What do you know about this consortium?

17. Did your college benefit from its participation in this consortium?

18. What were the specific benefits of this cooperation?

19. What other activities would you like to see the consortium undertake?

20. Have you noticed any change in the consortium's programs over the last few years?

21. Do you think that the consortium members are going to continue their cooperation once the Title III program has been completed?

22. What other important federal programs does your institution currently participate in?

23. Is there any link between these programs and the Title III program at your school?

(FOR BUSINESS MANAGERS ONLY)

24. How are Title III monies distributed to your college?

25. How are Title III monies allocated on your campus?

26. Are these monies audited on your campus?

So far our interview has focused on Title III. Now I would like to ask you about your views of this college.

27. What major changes have you seen on this campus since you arrived here?

→ When and how did these changes occur?

→ Were there any major curriculum changes?

→ Were there changes in the composition or quality of students, faculty, and administrators?

28. Are there major changes you would like to see here?

→ How would such changes be brought about?

→ Is it basically a question of money or staff which makes these changes difficult or impossible to achieve?

29. Why do you think most students come here?

→ Are parental or peer pressures important factors?

→ Are there particularly attractive programs on this campus?

→ What do most students want to get out of this college?

30. Do faculty, students, alumni, and administrators care a lot for this school?

→ Which group cares most, and how does it show?

→ Has morale among these groups changed any within the last four years?

→ Do the faculty seem to enjoy their teaching?

31. Who makes decisions on this campus?

→ Is decision-making on major issues concentrated in the hands of a few men, or is it pretty much spread around?

→ Who are the three most powerful people on campus?

→ Do the most influential people tend to sit on all important committees?

→ In what areas are faculty and students involved in decision-making?

→ Could you describe the process which eventually leads to a new or revised curriculum?

32. Do students and faculty see each other socially outside of classrooms and faculty offices?

→ Is there much socializing among the faculty?

→ Is there any socializing between faculty and administrators?

33. What is your opinion of the counseling and remedial programs on this campus?

→ Could you describe these programs?

→ How could these programs be improved?

→ Do students make much use of counseling facilities?

→ Are your remedial programs effective in bringing students into the "mainstream" of the student body?

34. What do most graduates of this school do after graduation?

→ Do your graduates find it easy to enter graduate and professional (or four-year) schools?

→ Do your graduates find jobs easily?

35. Have you seen any changes in the grading system here or in the attitudes people have about grades?

36. Could you describe briefly one or two important incidents that have taken place within the last few years and which have left their mark on the institution?

→ How did these incidents affect the institution?

→ Do you think that most people on campus would share your belief that these were major incidents?

37. If you had to point out one school which is similar to yours in most respects, which one would you chose?

→ Is there any other school that should ideally serve as a model for your institution?

→ Do you in fact expect your college to try to emulate that school?

ASE STUDY CHECK LIST

A. **Physical facilities**

General upkeep of buildings and grounds:	☐ Clean, wellgroomed.	☐	☐	☐ Dirty, neglected overgrown.
Classroom and facilities:	☐ Ample to handle enrollment-well supplied and equipped.	☐	☐	☐ Crowded, poorly equipped and supplied.
Faculty offices:	☐ Spacious, well appointed, privacy is possible.	☐	☐	☐ Crowded, dingy, makes advising of students very difficult.
Adequacy of cafeteria:	☐ Pleasant, good area for conversation, efficient system of food distribution & dish collection good quality.	☐	☐	☐ Loud, poorly maintained dirty, long waits for food, poor quality.
Administrator facilities:	☐ Overly lush--seems ostentations next to faculty areas.	☐	☐	☐ Crowded, noisy, no chance for privacy.
Student housing:	☐ Carefully planned, well suited to student needs and interests.	☐	☐	☐ Dungeon-like, no concern for student interest in planning or equipping dorms.

Parking facilities:	☐ Parking is major problem, a reserved space is a major status award--no concern for student parking.	☐	☐	☐ Parking is a minimal problem, well planned areas: democratically assigned.
Sports facilitie	☐ For the "pros" only, no facilities for leisure type sports & intra-mural.	☐	☐	☐ Sports are for all, good facilities for all in faculty, staff & student body who want to use them.
Library:	☐ Excellent collection, consistent with goals of institution, easily accessible, good reading areas, mirco-readers, etc.	☐	☐	☐ Poor collection, not well needed, reading areas little used.

B. **Faculty characteristics:**

Faculty morale:	☐ High marked by enthusiasm loyalty to institution, optimism, extended effort.	☐	☐	☐ Low-marked by resignation, pessimism, cynicism, minimal effort.
Faculty interest in students:	☐ High faculty actually spend much time advising students, take it seriously as part of their professional role, are easily accessible to students.	☐	☐	☐ Faculty spends almost no time with students outside of class, inaccessible.

Faculty concern for teaching:	☐ Systematic efforts underway to improve quality of teaching, teachers revise course materials and teaching strategies regularly, innovative teaching strategies are discussed and practiced.	☐	☐	☐ No systematic efforts to improve quality of teaching; little concern.
Faculty awareness of campus issues:	☐ Very tuned in to the campus as a whole--aware of issues, takes an active part.	☐	☐	☐ Faculty retreat into their own departments; no concern for general campus issues.
Faculty-administration relations:	☐ Much hostility and mistrust, each sees other as "enemy," poor communication, large rumor mill.	☐	☐	☐ Openness and sharing, others seen as collaborators, good communication, rumor killed at source.
Faculty competence:	☐ Most faculty not well trained in subject area, would have trouble answering their own test questions, don't keep up with field.	☐	☐	☐ Faculty well trained in subject areas, keep up with new developments, know the material without use of teacher "aides".
Counselling:	☐ Both personal and vocational, respect for student as an individual.	☐	☐	☐ Perfunctory, non-personal approach, inadequate staff, lack of care.

C. Student Characteristics

Student morale:	☐ High-enthusiastic about school, loyal, optimistic.	☐	☐	☐ Low-no concern for school--just "doing my thing," cynical, "getting by".
Student newspaper:	☐ Lively, well-written, many students participate, everybody reads it, faculty support, also administrators.	☐	☐	☐ Dull, inaccurate, run by only a few students, not read by faculty or administrators.
Student government:	☐ Active-provides a range of activity for the student body, good attendance at st. gov. meetings.	☐	☐	☐ No activity--students not interested--run by a few people.
Social atmosphere: (?)	☐ Formal, controlled parties and "dates" and formal boy-girl arrangements. Big parties are important.	☐	☐	☐ Much relaxed and casual contacts of sexes--after classes, in coffee shops. Formal parties not too important.
Fraternities and Sororities: ☐ Check here if non-existent:	☐ Academic and social status revolves around them. One's frat will "make you or break you."	☐	☐	☐ Fraternities are of little importance to students.

Diversity:	☐ There e several stude "cultures" on ca s, including the R , hippie, Brook ros. & jock types.	☐	☐	☐ All students are very much alike; no discernable sub-cultures.
Tolerance of Dev ce:	☐ Stud seem to accep thers who dres l act differently rom themselves.	☐	☐	☐ Much conformity; students reject others who don't dress and act as they do.
Personal Integr ion:	☐ Most tudents know what hey want, seem clea purposive, auto mous.	☐	☐	☐ Much confusion as to personal identity, life goals and career choice. Much more counselling needed.

B. Administration

Administrative Cooperation:	☐ Have od working team.	☐	☐	☐ Administrators compete with each other.
Administration/Faculty Communication:	☐ Administration not available to faculty.	☐	☐	☐ Faculty opinions actively solicited.
Administration/Student Communication:	☐ Admi istration not avai ble to students.	☐	☐	☐ Student opinions actively solicited.

Administration's c ncern for innovation:	☐ Mos wants to keep hings the way they e.	☐	☐	☐ Wants to innitiate sweeping changes.
Adm istrative com etence:	☐ Top ministrators and l supporting sta re very qual ied.	☐	☐	☐ Lack of skills in many areas of administration.
Ad nistrative str ture:	☐ Heavily bureaucratic, Admini tration gives orders to faculty & studen s.	☐	☐	☐ Very domestic, decisions by consensus of all.
Numb r of Administ tors:	☐ Indic s the nstitutio is too heavy ("fat	☐	☐	☐ Not enough people to do the job.

Some General Questions

1. Please mention some ways in which this campus could be called "developing" - what changes seem to be taking place? What, in your opinion, will these changes do to the institution?

2. Which of the changes you mentioned in 1. can be attributable to Title III?

   . Which " " are not " " (If you know, please indicate what initiated these changes).

   Can you make any comparisons between those changes that were established through Title III and those established through other sources?

3. What functions has the institution traditionally performed, and for what clienteles?

   Are these functions or clienteles shifting? Did Title III have anything to do with it?

4. Title III funds are supposed to help bring the institution into "the mainstream of American higher education." Is this happening?

5. Who knows what about Title III programs on this campus? Is Title III seen as a frill or as an essential part of the institution's program?

6. Why do students come to this institution? Does the institution help them to meet their needs?

7. What consequences would follow a loss of Title III funds here?

8. Any comments on the actual administration of Title III funds (e.g., are they kept separate, or funneled into projects along with funds from other sources? Could Title III funds be audited?

Please rank the institution in terms of the five characteristics listed below--the higher the number, the stronger or more pervasive a particular characteristic (circle the relevant number).

collegiate	4	3	2	1	0
expressive	4	3	2	1	0
intellectual	4	3	2	1	0
protective	4	3	2	1	0
vocational	4	3	2	1	0

TYPES OF COLLEGES

1. **INTELLECTUAL** - The college is dedicated to getting most of its graduates into graduate schools for advanced study. Faculty are doing some research, keep up with their learned society memberships. Faculty is strong political force on campus; controls much of campus decision making. Reading lists are long, students study hard, many of them want to become professors. Institution is concerned about its prestige, admission of students is very selective. Active alumni organization.

2. **COLLEGIATE** - The students come here to have fun and make social contacts they will use for the rest of their lives. Fraternities and sororities are very strong, athletics are important, and everyone goes to the games (including many old grads). Grades aren't very important to students. Talk in the student dining room is mostly about sports and members of the opposite sex. Little interest among students in politics or social reform. Classes are mostly lectures from textbooks, faculty give same courses year after year.

3. **VOCATIONAL** - The college is devoted to preparing students for specific vocations. Liberal arts courses are secondary to the major interest. Students spend most of their time in learning specific skills; courses are literal and non-speculative. Some students are "working their way through," by training programs in the occupation they wish to join. There is a very strong placement and vocational counselling service.

4. **PROTECTIVE** - This institution is designed to protect the student from evil forces, both in society and in himself. Student moral codes are carefully enforced, and are seen as an essential part of the college's role in character formation. The faculty do not push the students very hard, and often play the role of moral counsellor to the student. Presidential leadership is very strong, and he or she is seen as a moral as well as intellectual leader. Good character is seen as being more important than intellectual brilliance.

5. **EXPRESSIVE** - Students come here to express themselves. There is a strong program in the creative and performing arts, and there are courses in the writing of literature as well as the analysis of it. Student dress and behavior seems strange to outsiders. The administration is less powerful in terms of control, and encourages participation of everyone in decision-making. There is great interest of faculty and students in politics and questions of social reform - long debates are held between students and other students, as well as faculty, until well into the night. Social control of student behavior is minimal; the argument being that students must express themselves and develop personal autonomy and independence in order to attain maturity.

MOST COLLEGES COMBINE SEVERAL OF THESE TYPES. BUT WHICH ONE DOES YOURS MOST NEARLY RESEMBLE?